THEORETICAL AND DISCUSSION JOURNAL OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY

DECEMBER 1965

Marxism Today

EDITORIAL COMMENTS

JACK WODDIS — RHODESIA'S 1961 CONSTITUTION

LEV ALTER — PROBLEMS OF SOVIET ECONOMY

FRIDA KNIGHT — THE FRENCH RESISTANCE

BILL CARRITT — THE FREEDOM OF ART

DISCUSSION:

DENNIS GOODWIN — CHANGES IN WAGES STRUCTURE

RAYMOND SOUTHALL — PARADISE LOST AND THE PURITAN DEBACLE

EMILE BURNS — THE LAWS OF DIALECTICS

Monthly 2/-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Marxism Today

Vol. 9 No. 12

CONTENTS

		page
	Editorial Comments	353
Jack WODDIS	**Rhodesia's 1961 Constitution** ...	358
Lev ALTER	**Problems of Soviet Economy** ...	365
Frida KNIGHT	**The French Resistance**	368
Bill CARRITT	**The Freedom of Art**	376
DISCUSSION:		
Dennis GOODWIN	**Changes in Wages Structure** ...	378
Raymond SOUTHALL	**Paradise Lost and the Puritan Debacle**	380
Emile BURNS	**The Laws of Dialectics**	383

AMONG ARTICLES IN JANUARY AND FORTHCOMING ISSUES

Arnold KETTLE	**The Communist Party and the Left**
Margot HEINEMANN	**Modern British Poetry**
Jean SURET-CANALE	**The Traditional Societies of Tropical Africa**
Lawrence BRADSHAW	**Contemporary Soviet Art**
TLALE	**Britain and South Africa**
Kay BEAUCHAMP	**Racialism**
John BERGER	**Mannerism**
Jessie KOCMANOVA	**The Socialist Poems of William Morris**
Sergey PRONIN	**The Co-operative Movement: Its Aims and Principles**

Editor James Klugmann

Editorial Board

Professor J. D. Bernal
Emile Burns
Gabriel Carritt
Maurice Cornforth
Maurice Dobb
John Gollan
Jack Hendy
Arnold Kettle
John Lewis
Frank McKenna
John Mahon
Alan Morton
Professor George Thomson

Editorial Correspondence
James Klugmann
16 King Street, W.C.2

Advertisements
Margaret Manley,
above address

Orders and Subscriptions
usual agents or
Central Books Ltd.,
37 Gray's Inn Road,
London, W.C.1

Subscription rates
Six issues 14s. 6d.
Twelve issues 29s.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Editorial Comments

AT the moment of going to press, the white settlers have illegally declared the "independence" of Southern Rhodesia. The article on Rhodesia's 1961 Constitution, printed on pages 358-364 of this issue, was written before this latest development took place.

The exposure of the real nature of this Constitution, which Mr. Wilson was hoping to retain as the basis of an agreement with Mr. Ian Smith, is as timely as ever. Even in his final phone conversation with Mr. Smith, on the eve of U.D.I., Mr. Wilson stated ". . . as far as we are concerned, we have never ruled out the *status quo*". In other words, Mr. Wilson was prepared, if Mr. Smith did not seize power, to allow him to continue ruling Southern Rhodesia under the 1961 Constitution.

Significantly, the illegal Smith regime is still basing itself on this Constitution, apart from a few changes which Mr. Smith regards as essential to give him the formal power to rule in defiance of Britain. For this reason, too, an examination of the 1961 Constitution is essential to an understanding of the present crisis.

Finally, in the course of its examination of the Constitution, the article in this issue also reveals the real nature of the racialist police state existing in Rhodesia, against which the four million African people have been struggling. Rhodesia, under white minority rule, stands revealed as a vicious tyranny which aims to keep the African people in perpetual subjection.

Mr. Wilson's appeasement of Mr. Smith has led inevitably to U.D.I., as surely as Chamberlain's appeasement at Munich led to the Second World War. Dr. Verwoerd's open support for the illegal Smith regime shows how dangerous the situation has become. Mr. Wilson's partial sanctions will solve nothing. Sanctions must be made complete by an oil embargo, a cutting off of all trade, the freezing of Rhodesian assets in London, an end to postal and air communications.

Above all, these must be backed by force. In conjunction with the African states, and in co-operation with the African national movement in Rhodesia, the British Government should take all the necessary steps to bring Smith's regime to a speedy end, effect the release of the political prisoners, suspend the 1961 Constitution, and arrange a representative constitutional conference, in order to draw up a new constitution based on one man, one vote. This will make possible majority rule and so pave the way to a Rhodesia (or rather, Zimbabwe, to give it its correct African name) which is democratic, free from racialism and genuinely independent.

The Thirties

Not only readers of *Marxism Today* have been discussing "The Thirties". The B.B.C. also has been featuring some lectures on the period and Mr. A. J. P. Taylor, the historian, has naturally dealt with it at length in his volume of the Oxford History of England *English* (*sic*) *History* 1914-1945. Mr. Taylor sums up, "The 1930's have been called the blank years, the devil's decade. Its popular image can be expressed in two phrases: mass unemployment and 'appeasement'. No set of political leaders have been judged so contemptuously since the days of Lord North. Yet at the same time, most English people were enjoying a richer life than any previously known in the history of the world; longer holidays, shorter hours, higher real wages. The two sides of life did not join up. The public men had the air of appearing in a charade."

Riches for Whom?

We find the acceptance of a "richer life" for "most English people" extraordinary. The first four years of the decade were those of the greatest economic crisis in the history of British capitalism. For the basic industries—coal, shipbuilding, shipping, steel and cotton—were in full decay. The new industries that were emerging did not compensate for the decline of the old. What Mr. Taylor takes for "most English people" were sections of the middle strata mainly in South East England. The latter part of the decade was a "rentiers' paradise". The mass unemployment exerted a downward pressure on prices of home produced goods, and the world economic crisis a downward pressure on the foodstuffs and raw materials produced by the colonies and dominions. Imperialist parasitism was at its most horrific. So in the second half of the decade, if you were in a steady job not liable to the fluctuations of employment, or if you had a portfolio of stocks and shares, you did rather well. The prevailing low interest rates led, in South East

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

England, to a great extension of home ownership. If you shut your eyes to the decaying industries and regions, to the destruction of human beings by mass unemployment, to the robbery of the colonies, you could fool yourself that things were not doing so badly. We prefer the verdict of the editorial in the *Listener:*

> "Moreover the middle classes could feel indignant without suffering from creature discomforts themselves. Because of the competition [of workers] for work and the long clinging by governments to a free trade policy, it was a golden age for professional people who could buy food cheaply and even employ domestic servants" (*Listener*, October 23rd).

That is a much more accurate appraisal than that of "most English people" enjoying prosperity.

Pillars of Appeasement

This situation was, in the latter part of the decade, one of the pillars of "appeasement". No matter how much Chamberlain betrayed, the by-elections from 1935 onwards showed no swing, except on one occasion, against his policies. The other pillar of appeasement was of course lack of confidence in the Labour Party, springing from the debacle of the Labour Government of 1931.

But all people were not complacent. There was more political and economic controversy than at any comparable period of British history. People wanted to know why the terrible economic crisis had broken out in the midst of capitalist prosperity, why so-called parliamentary government went down, not only in Germany, but over most of the world. There was not only Italy and Germany, but Austria, Pilsudski's Poland, all the Baltic states, all the countries in the Balkans, not to speak of Japan. So in the universities and in the trade unions there grew up what Professor Cameron of Leeds University in a talk published in the *Listener* (October 21st) has called "the Marxist mood". The Marxist view of the world "especially in a period when economic theory was a good deal less sophisticated than it is today was a perfectly sensible one", says Professor Cameron.

We assert that it is so today; that there is no other valid theory of the developments of the 1930's; that when the Marxist theory is rejected we have nothing but superficial narrative to explain the events of the decade. Professor Cameron seeks to explain the Marxism of the 1930's as sterile. Yet under its influence Marxism has taken roots in British thinking; every book on history, political economy, sociology that is written today bears witness to its vitality. It was as a consequence of the "Marxist mood" that the British working class recovered faster than then seemed possible, from the horrible, demoralising effects of the Labour Government's debacle in 1931; it was because of Marxism that fascist propaganda had less effect in Britain than in any other major capitalist country in the world; it was in the great campaigns for a Peoples' Front that the ingrained "trade union narrowness" of sections of the British labour movement was overcome and that considerable sections of the middle strata began to draw nearer to the movement; it was in this period that there grew up gradually amongst the masses of the British people the determination never to tolerate mass unemployment again. The Editorial in the *Listener* (October 21st) tells us that "it is hard at present to believe that Englishmen at least will ever look back on this decade with much pride". On the contrary all those who as Marxists or near Marxists came out against fascism, with its drive to war, have reason to be proud of the stand they took. They created a massive change in public opinion. Though capitalism is still here, and is aided by the inept and sometimes traitorous leadership of the Labour Party, it has had to make concessions to keep its grip and is always conscious of the popular forces breathing down its neck.

Modern Capitalism

State monopoly capitalism (a much better term than "a mixed economy" since it pinpoints the monopolists as the dominant class) is still operating in the interests of a small monopolist oligarchy; it still engages in imperialist wars against small nations (Vietnam), is seeking to emasculate the trade unions, and to undermine the present imperfect bourgeois democracy; it is seeking to undermine the worthwhile reforms won in past struggles (the attacks on the health services); it is bitterly opposing, in the age of automation, the rational utilisation of the mighty forces of wealth production in the interest of the common people.

Here the 1930 conception of a broad people's alliance against the monopolists, with the working class at the centre, points the way forward. Of course the keenest analysis is required of the present stage of capitalism, and Marxism is best equipped to make it.

Soviets in 1930's

Naturally in all the discussions of the 1930's there are side kicks at the Soviet Union. Professor Cameron records his disillusionment when he opened his newspaper and got the news of the Soviet-German non-aggression pact. He does not tell us, however, what his emotions were when the year before he read of the Munich pact between Nazi Germany, Italy, Britain and France, which Western diplomacy hoped would divert Nazi

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

aggression towards the Soviet Union. The Non-Aggression Pact was a move to counter this, a "counter-Munich" which in fact succeeded in delaying the onslaught.

Mr. A. J. P. Taylor, the ageing *enfant terrible* of historians, writes, "The Nazi dictatorship was no worse than that in some other countries, particularly that in Soviet Russia, with whom, all the same, the Left was advocating an alliance." But surely it was Nazi Germany, not Soviet Russia that was driving headlong to war. The alliance was ultimately formed and the Soviet Union took on the main burden of the land fighting. Without Soviet participation anything from a million to two million more British lives (not merely English, Mr. Taylor) would have been lost.

The victory did much to change the face of the world. It led to the emergence of socialist regimes in Eastern Europe, it helped the Chinese revolution to victory over Chiang Kai-Shek, it inspired the tremendous growth of the colonial liberation movement, and led to the revival of bourgeois democracy in the major capitalist countries.

It was a great world-changing victory, even though much still remains to be changed. There is no need to tell Marxists that in some respects the 1960's are better than the 1930's. They after all were a major force in bringing the changes about.

Death of Oskar Lange

Professor Oskar Lange, the Polish economist, who died in Westminster Hospital (where he had been transferred from a sanatorium in Italy for an operation) on October 2nd, will be a grave loss both to his own country and to Marxian economists everywhere. His activities were extraordinarily many-sided and far from confined to the theoretical or academic. He was at his death Vice-Chariman of the Polish Council of State and a member of the Central Committee of the Polish Workers' Party; he had been Chairman of the State Economic Council in the late '50's (and largely the author of what was known at the time as the Polish 'new economic model'); in the years after the war he was successively Polish Ambassador to the United States and Polish permanent representative on the Security Council of the United Nations. His funeral in Warsaw was attended by thousands; he was accorded military honours, a guard of honour being mounted by the leaders of the Govermnent and of the Party.

During the war he had written a famous political letter to fellow-Poles in exile urging reconciliation with the Soviet Union, and he had a much-publicised meeting with Stalin in 1944 in Moscow to discuss Soviet-Polish relations.

From his student days in Cracow (and even at secondary school) he was interested in Marxism; from 1927 he was a member of the Polish Socialist Party, belonging always to its Left-wing (also to the very radical Union of Independent Socialist Youth); and when in 1947 Socialists and Communists joined in forming the United Workers' Party, he played a prominent role in the unification and acted for a time as Chairman of the Party's Parliamentary Group.

As an economist Oskar Lange had many friends among academic economists in Britain and America and was widely respected as a mathematical economist of the first rank (on his death he was still a member of both the council and the executive of the Econometric Society). In face of the difficulties of an academic career for a left-wing socialist in pre-war Poland, he took advantage of a Rockefeller Fellowship in 1935 to visit first England and then U.S.A.; in 1938 he was invited to lecture at the University of California, at Stanford and at Columbia, and the following year was appointed to a Chair at the University of Chicago (first as assistant professor and then as full professor): a post which he continued to occupy until 1945. Apart from a number of articles in economic journals, he wrote two well-known books during his stay in America. The first, *On the Economic Theory of Socialism*, published by the University of Minnesota Press in 1938, was an answer to the contention of the reactionary Mises-school that under socialism rational economic calculation would be impossible, and at the same time an exposition of a decentralised economic 'model' of a socialist system operating on the basis of flexible 'accounting prices'. The second, *Price Flexibility and Employment* (1944), was a critique, at a high theoretical level, of the overall stability of a capitalist economy, as well as an examination of the relation between Keynesian and pre-Keynesian theory.

Oskar Lange's Post-War Record

Back in Poland after 1945, in addition to his manifold political activities, he lectured on the theory of statistics at the Central School of Planning and Statistics in Warsaw (where his photograph occupies a prominent place on the wall of its main seminar room), also on the history of economic thought at the Institute of Social Sciences of the Central Committee of the Party. In 1956, after a visit to India as an economic adviser, he was appointed to the Chair of Political Economy at the University of Warsaw. In the words of a Polish biographer, his university lectures from then on "became of paramount importance in the Polish scientific world". There followed a steady stream of publications, mostly based on these lectures. First

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

came his *Introduction to Econometrics* (which went into two editions, and is translated into English as well as Russian and several other languages). Then a work on *Optimum Decision-Making*, on the *Theory of Reproduction and Accumulation*, on *Wholes and Parts*, and an *Introduction to Economic Cybernetics*. In 1959 appeared the first volume of what was to have been a long-planned 3-volume work on *Political Economy* (the English translation following in 1963). Our irreparable loss is that the second volume remained unwritten at his death. In 1961 Polish Scientific Publishers brought out in an imposing volume a collection of all his economic writings, 1930-60; and a year ago the volume of essays in honour of his 60th birthday referred to in these notes in October.

In his personal life Oskar Lange was quite the reverse of the 'great man'. Always faithful to old friends and comrades he would always visit them on his journeys abroad despite his many preoccupations or entertain them if they came to Warsaw. By his students he was beloved as well as valued for the great trouble and time he would devote to helping them individually. He leaves a wife and a son and daughter.

Gas in South Vietnam

"Gas", wrote *The Times* leader (March 23rd), when the world press was first informed of its use by U.S. troops in South Vietnam, "is one of the most emotive words in the dictionary of warfare." And so it should be! The revelation of its use by the U.S. invading forces gave rise to the same sort of denials and evasions as were experienced over the use of toxic chemicals, euphonistically called "defoliants", and of napalm. Both were denied indignantly until the truth could no longer be hidden.

The gas used, said the U.S. spokesman, was not lethal, therefore not forbidden by the 1925 Geneva Treaty; and even if it was, the U.S. had not ratified the Treaty anyway, so was not bound by it. It was more humane than other ways of detecting "Vietcong", argued others. Defence Secretary McNamara admitted that the U.S. had supplied three types of gas from mid-1962, but "explained" that the gas used in March only caused chest pains, choking and vomiting, that it was "only temporarily disabling", so rendering the "enemy incapable of fighting". (It was in fact used against civilians.)

The Federation of American Scientists issued a statement strongly objecting to its use. The *New York Times* (March 24th) admitted:

> "People—ordinary people everywhere—have a strong psychological revulsion, if not horror, at the idea of poisonous gas . . . even this kind of gas can be fatal to the very young, the very old, and those ill with heart and lung ailments."

Despite the protests the U.S. Government disclosed that it would continue to use gas in Vietnam and there would be no need for those employing it to get special authorisation. It appears to be part of the normal equipment of the U.S. Marines in Vietnam, and there have been further cases of its use in recent months against people who had taken refuge in caves against bombing.

Last March world public opinion was so strong in its condemnation of the use of gas, that it came as a shock to the U.S. authorities (and even Michael Stewart in the United States made a mild protest), who were forced at least to limit its use for a time.

But now that the protest has died down somewhat, the U.S. forces are at it again and hoping to incorporate gas into their normal repertoire of horror weapons. The movement of protest that was so vigorous last March must not be allowed to fade.

Christian Civilisation

In the discussions concerning Southern Rhodesia one of the arguments used by Smith is that he is anxious to defend what he calls "Christian civilisation" from the fate which has overtaken the people in the independent African states. It is interesting, therefore, to compare the educational advance for Africans in Smith's "Christian" state and that which exists in the independent state of Ghana.

In the secondary schools in Southern Rhodesia figures for 1963 showed a total of 336 African boys in form 4 and 50 African girls; the figures for 1964 were 565 boys and 90 girls. In the Upper Sixth form the figures for 1963 were 36 African pupils, and for 1964 35. In the case of the Upper Sixth these total figures include boys and girls.

The interesting thing about these figures for Southern Rhodesia is that under the 1961 Constitution, in order to qualify to be on the "A" roll for voting the minimum income is £332 (which is way above the average level of wages and peasant earnings—for further details see article in this issue on Southern Rhodesia) together with education up to Standard 4 in a secondary school.

Recent figures given by President Nkrumah in his speech to the Ghana Parliament on August 24th show the striking advances made in this country since it secured independence under African majority rule.

President Nkrumah revealed that by September this year the total number of children in primary and middle schools in Ghana reached 1½ million and that the aim to be achieved by the end of the seven-year plan is 2 million. This means that a quarter of the total population will be in primary and middle schools by the end of the seven-year plan. In addition, there are no less than 10,000 students in teacher

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

training colleges, and the target for these is 21,000 by 1970. The plans also include the opening of 30 new colleges for this purpose.

Beginning with the current school year, secondary education is now free throughout Ghana. Primary education has been free for some time. (By contrast, Africans have to pay for education in Southern Rhodesia, and all the schools to which Africans can go are missionary schools.)

Ghana is also increasing the number of technical institutes, aiming to build one in each region; a medical school is being created; a university college of agriculture is to be established; and all this is in addition to the existing higher education which has been developed in Ghana since independence. The University of Ghana now has 2,000 students and within the next five years aims to have 5,000. The Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology has 1,100 students and aims to have 3,500 by 1970. The University College of Science Education is expected to have 3,000 students by 1970.

Indicative of the whole attitude of the Ghana Government is the news given in President Nkrumah's report that a college for the training of teachers for the deaf and dumb is almost completed, and a college is also to be established for the training of teachers for the blind.

What a striking contrast is the educational advance possible for African peoples once they are able to run their own countries. And what a striking reply to Smith's propaganda.

The "Poor Nations"

The ten years' period from 1960 onwards was scheduled by the United Nations to be a "Development Decade" for those independent states still struggling to transform their backward economies. Half way through this decade *The Times* (16.9.65) gave considerable space to George D. Woods, now president of the World Bank, to sum up the results of the past five years, under the title "Poor Nations Need More Aid".

This was no happy picture. It was admitted that "most of the countries of the underdeveloped world still do not have enough earnings and savings of their own to create these pre-conditions of development". Nor was any explanation given for this situation.

In reality the countries concerned are *not* poor. They have rich natural and mineral resources, but millions of their people suffer poverty and starvation because the big foreign monopolies rob them of their resources.

"MARXISM TODAY"

Week of Discussion on

"BRITAIN TODAY AND TOMORROW"

Programme:

The following are at Mahatma Ghandi Hall, 41 Fitzroy Square, W.1, at 7.45 p.m.

1. **BRITAIN'S CRISIS**—Economic, Political and Moral
   A dialogue between a Marxist and a Non-Marxist
   Chairman: James Klugmann
   Monday, January 3rd, 1966

2. **ECONOMIC PLANNING UNDER A LABOUR GOVERNMENT**
   Questions from the audience answered by a panel consisting of: J. R. Campbell, J. Mortimer and M. Posner
   Chairman: Jack Hendy
   Tuesday, January 4th, 1966

The following are at Caxton Hall, Westminster, S.W.1, at 7.45 p.m.

3. **SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY AND SOCIALISM**
   A lecture by Dr. S. Lilley
   Chairman: Frank Stanley
   Wednesday, January 5th, 1966

4. **PLANNING A NEW BRITAIN**
   The kind of country the people need to live and work in and the obstacles to its achievement, discussed by planners and architects.
   Speakers: W. Houghton-Evans, Dave Grove and Arthur Korn
   Chairman: Kenneth Campbell
   Thursday, January 6th, 1966

The following are at Mahatma Ghandi Hall at 7.45 p.m. (except Session 6)

5 **THE ARTS AND SOCIALISM**
   Speakers: Lindsay Anderson, John Berger, Arnold Kettle
   Chairman: Stuart Douglass
   Friday, January 7th, 1966

6. **THE CONDITION OF MAN**
   A dialogue between a Marxist and a Humanist
   Speaker: Martin Milligan
   Chairman: Maurice Cornforth
   Saturday, January 8th, 1966, at 2.45 p.m.

7. **THE TRANSITION TO SOCIALISM**
   A discussion on the way to Socialism in Britain including the questions of freedom and democracy.
   Speakers: John Gollan, Ralph Miliband
   Chairman: Brian Simon
   Sunday, January 9th, 1966

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Rhodesia's 1961 Constitution

Jack Woddis[1]

THE Southern Rhodesian Premier, Mr. Smith, has stated his claim for independence on the basis of the 1961 Constitution. Acceptance of this constitution as the basis of independence was also a feature of the policy adopted at the Tory Party Conference in October 1965. The resolution adopted on this matter declared, *inter alia*, ". . . a solution will be found by negotiation on the basis of guaranteeing the 1961 Constitution which enshrines the principle and intention of unimpeded progress to majority rule . . ."

On the other hand, the African people and their organisations and leaders have repeatedly rejected the 1961 Constitution, have refused to work it despite every kind of blandishment, and have emphasised time and again that they will never accept this constitution as the basis for independence.

Amidst all the discussions about a possible unilateral declaration of independence (UDI) by Mr. Smith, many people have overlooked the realities of the 1961 Constitution, while others have mistakenly regarded it as a valuable reserve on which the British Government could fall back in the event of the settlers being deterred from taking the plunge.

This, in fact, was the position taken by Mr. Wilson in his talks with the Rhodesian African leaders during his visit to Salisbury at the end of October. The official statements of the British Government spokesmen after Mr. Wilson's first talks with Mr. Joshua Nkomo and Rev. N. Sithole (the leaders of ZAPU and ZANU) made it clear that Mr. Wilson claimed that he could persuade Mr. Smith to refrain from UDI *providing that the Africans agreed to work the 1961 Constitution.*

It is therefore important to examine this Constitution in some detail, to see what it contains, and to examine to what extent it gives the African majority the possibility of achieving their democratic rights and self-determination.

The Southern Rhodesian Constitutional Conference was held from 16th to 24th January, and 30th January to 7th February, 1961 (See *Cmnd.* 1291). It took place in Salisbury, under the chairmanship first, of Sir Edgar Whitehead, at that time Premier of Southern Rhodesia, and then, in its second phase, under Mr. Duncan Sandys, then Secretary of State for Commonwealth Relations. Present at the Conference were representatives of the British and Southern Rhodesian Governments, of the United Federal Party (the predominantly European party which was then in power in Southern Rhodesia), the other settlers' Party, the Dominion Party (well to the right of the reactionary United Federal Party), the National Democratic Party (including both Mr. Joshua Nkomo and the Rev. N. Sithole, who now lead ZAPU and ZANU respectively)[2], the small more liberal European party—the Central Africa Party, the Coloured Community (people of mixed racial origin), the Asians, and the Chiefs.

At the conclusion of their deliberations, the delegates agreed on the basic principles for preparing a new Constitution for Southern Rhodesia. The Dominion Party, which was represented by four M.P's, three of whom are now Ministers in Mr. Smith's Government, was opposed to the franchise proposals, urging that "there should be no change insofar as this would involve a lowering of existing standards", and advocating that "the present Lower Roll should be eliminated". In other words, Mr. Smith's colleagues were determined to prevent even the smallest concession to the African people.

The mass party of the African people, the National Democratic Party, urged the adoption of the principle of "one man, one vote", but the other delegates were opposed to this. In the event, the NDP delegates initially agreed not to oppose the Constitution, but when the full meeting of the NDP Executive Committee subsequently considered the matter in detail, it was decided to reject the 1961 Constitutional proposals.

These proposals were worked on by the British Government after the conclusion of the Constitutional Conference, and were presented to the British Parliament, in the form of a Southern Rhodesia

[1] See the first paragraph in Editorial Comments.

[2] The African people of Southern Rhodesia established their main political party in 1957, with the setting up of the new African National Congress (ANC). In 1959, this party was banned by the Southern Rhodesian Government. On January 1st, 1960, the African people established their new Party, the National Democratic Party (NDP). This, too, was banned in 1961, to be replaced ten days later by the Zimbabwe African Peoples Union (ZAPU). The last-named was banned towards the end of 1962. Divisions subsequently arose within ZAPU, and a small group broke away in July 1963, to form the Zimbabwe African National Union (ZANU). The banned ZAPU declined to set up a new party and continued to organise as an illegal party; at the same time a legal body, the People's Caretaker Council (PCC), was set up. This, too, was subsequently banned.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Constitution, in June 1961 (see *Cmnd.* 1400). In considering this Constitution, there are four main questions to examine: the Declaration of Rights, the Constitutional Council, the Representation and Franchise, and the question of Amendments to the Constitution and the Reserved Powers of the United Kingdom. In examining these four questions one has perforce to examine in some detail the economic and social conditions of the African people, and the extent, if any, of democratic liberties. In all cases, this examination must be made within the context of a society based on the most blatant practice of racial discrimination.

The Declaration of Rights

The Declaration of Rights, which is embodied in the 1961 Constitution, was supposed to have been inserted in order to protect the democratic rights of the people. The 1961 Constitution states: "The Declaration of Rights . . . will state first of all the fundamental rights and freedoms to be enjoyed by the people of Southern Rhodesia. Such rights will apply without distinction of race, colour or creed . . ." (Clause 38). The Declaration itself, which is contained in Appendix 2 of the Constitution, refers (point b) to "freedom of conscience, of expression, and of assembly and association". Section 9 of the Declaration states that "no person shall be hindered in the enjoyment of his freedom of expression, that is to say, freedom to hold opinions and to receive and impart ideas and information without interference, and freedom from interference with his correspondence".

Section 10 (1) states that "no person shall be hindered in the enjoyment of his freedom of assembly and association, that is to say, his right to assemble freely and associate with other persons and in particular to form or belong to trade unions or other associations for the protection of his interests". Section 11 (1) declares "No written law shall contain any discriminatory provision"; and Section 11 (2) states that a provision shall be regarded as discriminatory if persons of a particular description by race, tribe, colour or creed are prejudiced

> "by being subjected to a condition, restriction or disability to which persons of another such description are not made subject of; or by according to persons of another such description of a privilege or advantage which is not accorded to persons of the first-mentioned description".

One has only to take a quick glance at what is the actual situation in Southern Rhodesia to appreciate how useless was this Declaration in practice. The white settler government had no intention of abiding by its provisions or its spirit; its inclusion in the 1961 Constitution was solely for the purpose of misleading British public opinion.

Freedom of association is specified in the Declaration of the 1961 Constitution—but every political party of the African people has been banned in turn. Trade unions are allowed, but European farmers prevent African agricultural labourers from forming trade unions; and for other African workers, the 1959 Industrial Conciliation Act provided for the setting up of so-called multi-racial unions in which votes of Grade A (journeymen—in practice, almost entirely European) count as four times the votes of Grade C (unskilled labour, almost entirely African). The Act even specifies that union branch committees must have five Grade A members and only one Grade C; and the Registrar is given powers to increase the representation of "skilled and minority" interests (i.e. European) on the union governing bodies from the branch level upwards.[3]

Freedom of assembly is asserted in the Declaration—but when peaceful crowds assembled to greet their leader, Joshua Nkomo, during the visit of Mr. Wilson, the police attacked them and set fierce Alsatian police dogs on them.

Freedom of expression is likewise specified—but the *Daily News* has been suppressed, students are asked to pledge themselves not to take part in politics, 35,250 members of ZAPU and ZANU are in prison or detained, the former premier, Mr. Garfield Todd, is restricted, and so is ZAPU's European legal adviser, Mr. Leo Baron.

A series of repressive laws make a complete mockery of the Declaration. When the 1960 Law and Order (Maintenance) Act was passed in 1960, the then Federal Chief Justice, Sir Robert Tredgold, resigned, stating that the Act "will remove any lingering vestige of doubt whether Southern Rhodesia can properly be called a police state . . . it outrages every basic human right". This Act is still on the Statute book.

In May, 1961, the Catholic bishops of Southern Rhodesia issued a Pastoral Instruction, *Peace Through Justice*, which declared that . . . "the doctrine of racial superiority as taught *and practiced* by many in this country, differs little in essence from that of the Nazis. . . ."

The Instruction went on to declare:

> "Wages are inadequate, housing conditions in many instances are unworthy of human beings, terms of employment are such that husbands are separated for long periods from their families, and in many towns, locations and compounds, married quarters are so scarce that married workers pose as single men in order to find employment or

[3] See the present author's *Africa, the Lion Awakes*, pp. 70-76, for further details on trade union rights in Southern Rhodesia.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> accommodation. . . . Such a state of affairs cries to heaven for vengeance. . . . For far too long has this state of affairs been allowed to exist without protest. . . ."

A number of further repressive Acts and administrative measures have been since introduced. There are such Acts in operation in Southern Rhodesia as the Subversive Activities Act, the Unlawful Organisations Act, the Preventive Detention Act, and many others. The *New Statesman* (October 22, 1965) has summed up the position of democratic rights in Southern Rhodesia in these terms:

> "Any statement imputing an improper motive to the legislature, government, ministers, officer or department of government is *prima facie* subversive; so is any statement likely (even if not intended) to excite dissatisfaction against the government, or to induce any person, actively or passively, to resist any law. Any organisation or publication can be banned at the government's pleasure; any person can be restricted to any area for 5 years. The police can, without warrant, enter any home in which they suspect a subversive statement may be made. The courts must impose minimum sentences for a wide range of convictions: 3-10 years for intimidation directed at opinion; 5-20 years for throwing, or threatening to throw, an article at a car; 2-7 years for boycott; the death penalty for arson against property. All these laws, and others, are drastically applied.
>
> "But, for any White Rhodesian inclined to resist UDI, the final irony may be prosecution under the Preservation of Constitutional Government Act. This provides imprisonment for up to 20 years for any resident who, within or without Rhodesia, even suggests the creation of any body attempting to coerce the government—coercion being defined to include the mere threat of boycott or passive resistance to any law. This comprehensive law has extra-territorial effect: woe to any Rhodesian who, at a British teach-in, let alone the UN, campaigns against the Land Apportionment Act! Such penalties apply to anyone who seeks the aid of even a single individual to suggest the formation of a pressure group. Moreover, as with many other Rhodesian laws, the accused must prove his innocence."

The Constitutional Council

So much for the Declaration of Rights. The 1961 Constitution also established a new body, the Constitutional Council, whose job is to "advise the Legislative Assembly as to whether its Bills are in conformity with the Declaration of Rights". The setting up of this Council meant the elimination of most of the reserved powers concerning legislation in Southern Rhodesia which had hitherto been vested in the Government of the United Kingdom. For nearly forty years, ever since the original 1923 Act, the British Government, despite its reserved powers, had done nothing to stop the appalling practice of racial discrimination and anti-democratic repression which was such a feature of the political scene in Southern Rhodesia. The new Constitutional Council has proved of similar uselessness to the African people, and to those few progressive Europeans who are opposed to the white settler Government.

Why is this so? Why have these provisions of the Constitution proved valueless? It is simply a question of political power. The decisive state power—the armed forces, the police, the machinery of law and government—remains in the hands of the representatives of the 220,000 Europeans; and the four million Africans are effectively deprived of any say in their own country. It is this which explains the racial discrimination and repression. It is this which explains why the economic wealth of the country—the best land, the mineral resources, the sources of power, banking, insurance, manufacturing and so on—are in the hands of Europeans, while Africans starve on a wretched pittance.

The 1961 Constitution is therefore a sham and a deception. The Tory Party Conference resolution claimed that African progress towards majority rule is "enshrined" in the 1961 Constitution. Similar claims have been made by Mr. Wilson in his TV broadcast setting out his five principles; and by other political spokesmen in Britain and in Southern Rhodesia. Nothing could be further from the truth. The 1961 Constitution was designed to maintain white minority domination, and nothing makes this more clear than the franchise and electoral provisions which are the heart of this Constitution. These provisions are so blatantly discriminatory in their purpose that the first act of the new Constitutional Council—if it was really to carry out the job for which it was ostensibly established—would have been to challenge the franchise and electoral arrangements laid down in the Constitution as being a direct violation of the Declaration of Rights included in that same Constitution.

Representation and Franchise

The 1961 Constitution introduced a most elaborate system for elections designed to block any possibility of the Africans becoming the decisive voice in the Southern Rhodesian Legislative Assembly. Under the new arrangements, there are two electoral rolls, "A" and "B". Roll "A" elects 50 Members of the Legislative Assembly, and Roll "B" elects 15. It is therefore obvious that ability to get on to the "A" Roll is decisive. To be eligible for either Roll, one must be over 21 years of age, be a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

citizen of the country, have residence and language qualifications. But to be on the "A" Roll one must have the following additional qualifications:

(a) Income of *£720* during each of two years preceding date of claim for enrolment, *or* ownership of immovable property of value of £1,500.

OR

(b) (i) Income of *£480* during each of two years preceding date of claim for enrolment, *or* ownership of immovable property of value of £1,000; *and*
(ii) completion of a course of primary education of prescribed standard.

OR

(c) (i) Income of *£300* during each of two years preceding date of claim for enrolment, *or* ownership of immovable property of value of £500; *and*
(ii) four years' Secondary education of prescribed standard.

OR

(d) Appointment to the office of Chief or Headman.
(See *Southern Rhodesian Constitution: Summary of Proposed Changes—Cmnd. 1399*).

The first thing to be noticed about these categories (apart from (d) which only concerns a few hundred Chiefs and Headmen) is that the higher your income, the lower is the educational qualification required. Despite all the propaganda of Smith and Co. that the "Africans are not yet educated enough to vote", the highest income category—£720 a year—*does not need any education whatsoever*. You can be an illiterate fool—but if you are rich you can vote.

It has been claimed by supporters of the white settlers that the franchise terms are not discriminatory since they do not refer to categories by race but only by education and income and property. An examination of what these income and educational qualifications mean in practice shows only too clearly that they are blatantly discriminatory. Let us examine income first. The average earnings of the European workers in 1961, when the Constitution was drawn up, were £1,036 16s. 0d. a year, and for the 612,573 African wage worker were £75 12s. 0d. Over half the African workers, mainly those in agriculture, earned less than £5 a month. Thus the average earnings of *European* wage and salary workers was above the *maximum income* qualification for the "A" Roll, and the average of the *African was below the minimum* qualification. An analysis made in 1964[4] shows that at the time of the 1961 September Census, out of 612,573 African employees, only 6,100 or *less than one per cent*, received £25 a month or more—the lowest income qualifying figure for getting on to the "A" Roll. The latest figures show average earnings for African workers (including payments in kind which are not included in the income levels for purposes of registering for voting) as £121 a year, and for European workers, £1,241 a year. Most African workers receive much less than £121.

The majority of Africans in Southern Rhodesia are not workers but peasants. According to Dr. Montague Yudelman *(Africans on the Land)*, average *cash* earnings of African subsistence farmers are £4 per head per year. Other estimates give £12 per family holding, which, when one takes into account the number of people living off a family holding, works out at even less than Dr. Yudelman's estimate.

It is therefore clear that the majority of Africans are entirely ineligible for registering on the "A" Roll by virtue of their low income levels. But this is not only a case of racial discrimination; it is also a case of *class* discrimination, since the provisions enable a small handful of better off Africans to qualify, but debar the workers and peasants, who are the overwhelming majority.

The Rhodesian Government pretends that these income disabilities of the Africans have nothing to do with racial discrimination. A handout of the Southern Rhodesia Information Service (*This is Southern Rhodesia*) argues that "people of any race may qualify for either roll". It adds that "no one is barred from the vote by reason of race". It conveniently forgets to point out that it is a white minority Government which wields effective power—and that this power enables it to enact Minimum Wage Regulations, based on a "Poverty Datum Line" system, which lays down a minimum wage of £9 10s. a month (including £1 for accommodation) for workers employed in the towns—with a lower level in the countryside. It fails to point out that employment for Africans means employment in European concerns which naturally keep to the abysmally low minimum wage regulations of the Government.

In the same way, the white settlers' Government has enacted the Land Apportionment Act which deprives the 4 million Africans of nearly half the land in Southern Rhodesia, confining them to small six-acre plots on the worst, sandy soils. In addition, as Patrick Keatley has pointed out *(The Politics of Partnership)*, the Tobacco Marketing Board uses its powers to prevent African farmers growing the higher-revenue Virginia type tobaccos; an African selling maize to the Grain Marketing Board receives only about two-thirds of the price given to the European farmer, since the African has to pay three special levies—for the Native Development Fund, for a traders' handling margin, and for a "transport equalisation fund charge". Under the terms of the

[4] See *National Accounts and Balance of Payments of Northern Rhodesia, Nyasaland and Southern Rhodesia, 1954-63—Salisbury, 1964. Table 163.*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Hippo Valley Agreement, which provides for sugar production by a private company from the irrigated area, the Agreement signed with the Government states: "The Government shall assist the Company with the selection of suitable settlers, all of whom shall be of European origin".

Thus the political power in the hands of the white minority enables it at every point of the economy to ensure that African incomes are held down, not only in the interests of high rates of profit, but also to prevent all but a few Africans from qualifying for registration on the decisive "A" Roll. And if, at any time, it appears that more Africans than were intended are creeping up towards a higher income level, the Government, under the terms of the 1961 Constitution, simply increases the income qualifications.

The "B" Roll

When one examines the "B" Roll, here the income qualifications are considerably lower, ranging from £240 a year down to £120.

The details of "B" Roll qualifications in the 1961 Constitution were stated as follows:

(a) Income at the rate of £240 per annum during the 6 months preceding date of claim for enrolment, *or* ownership of immovable property of value of £450.

OR

(b) (i) Income at the rate of £120 per annum during the six months preceding date of claim for enrolment, *or* ownership of immovable property of value of £250; *and*
(ii) two years' secondary education.

OR

(c) Persons over 30 years of age with:
(i) Income at the rate of £120 per annum during the six months preceding date of claim for enrolment *or* ownership of immovable property of value of £250; *and*
(ii) completion of a course of primary education of a prescribed standard.

OR

(d) Persons over 30 years of age with:
Income at the rate of £180 per annum during the six months preceding the date of claim for enrolment, *or* ownership of immovable property of value of £350.

OR

(e) All kraal heads with a following of 20 or more heads of families.

OR

(f) Ministers of Religion.

Even here, however, it will be noticed that the lowest income level is on a par with the average earnings of African workers, and it is therefore instructive to find that in September 1964, the Southern Rhodesian Government simply increased the income qualifications on both rolls by 10 per cent, thus making the minimum on the "A" Roll now £330, and on the "B" Roll £132. Thus, once again, the lowest minimum on both rolls is *above* the average wage of the African worker.

The question of raising the income qualification so as to keep Africans off the register is an old trick of the white settlers of Southern Rhodesia. In 1898, before there was a two-roll system, there was a single income qualification of £50 a year. In 1912 it was raised to £100; in 1951, to £240. It was raised again in 1958. Since 1961, with the introduction of the two-roll system, no increases in the income qualification had taken place until September 1964. By the increases introduced then, the Smith Government indicated that it was still ready to play the traditional trick. No matter what the Africans do, the elusive right to vote is effectively kept out of the reach of the majority of the people; and if they seem to be approaching near to their goal, then once again the white settlers remove the goal a bit further away. The Africans can never win on this basis. One might just as well play football against a team which has the power to change the rules every time you come near to scoring.

The same discrimination is shown in relation to the question of education. The lowest income category on the "A" Roll requires an educational qualification of *four years' Secondary education*. At the end of 1961, at the time that the Constitution laying down these conditions was introduced, the enrolment of African students in all secondary schools in Southern Rhodesia was as follows:

	Government		*Mission*		
	Boys	*Girls*	*Boys*	*Girls*	*Total*
Form I	604	218	1,327	390	2,539
Form II	318	127	919	253	1,617
Form III	108	18	278	40	444
Form IV	95	13	235	21	364
Lower VI	67	4	—	—	71
Upper VI	30	4	—	—	34
	1,222	384	2,759	704	5,069

From the above figures one can see that for the decisive Form IV there was a total of only 364 pupils. By 1964, this figure had crept to 655; with a total of only 35 in the Upper Sixth form. Thus, even if Africans can climb into that group of better-off citizens earning £330 a year, only a handful of them can pass the educational qualifications. Official estimates project that by 1973 there will be about 3,500 African children in Form IV of secondary schools;[5] by 1970, according to present plans, about 12,000 Africans will have emerged

[5] See *Crisis in Rhodesia:* by Nathan Shamuyarira (p. 129).

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from school with some secondary education.[6] These figures show conclusively that at the present rate of advance it will be decades before anything like sufficient Africans pass the educational barrier to getting on to the "A" Roll. Today nearly 90,000 Europeans are registered on the "A" Roll. Even if 3,000 Africans a year passed through Standard IV of secondary school, it would take at least thirty years to reach the European figure on the "A" Roll. On the basis of the 1964 figure of 655 African Form IV pupils, it would take nearly 140 years. And even then, the African might still not qualify because of his inability to reach the minimum income level.

As with income levels, the Rhodesian Government tries to argue that the lower educational qualifications of the Africans are not due to racial discrimination practised by the Government. Once again, it avoids admitting that it is its own educational policy which is responsible. Although the African people have to pay for education, the Government spends its educational funds on a blatantly discriminatory basis. For the 1964-65 school year, the Government of Southern Rhodesia spent an average of £110 per European child, compared with £9 12s. per African child. Thus, the bulk of African children have to depend on the charity-backed missionary schools.

Although, admittedly, Africans over 30 years of age, with an income qualification of £132 a year, can qualify for the "B" Roll on the basis of completion of a course of solely primary education of a prescribed standard, it counts for very little, for even if half a million Africans so qualified, the "B" Roll can only elect 15 out of 65 Members of the Legislative Assembly.

Thus, in every way, the franchise and representation clauses of the 1961 Constitution are heavily weighted against the Africans and provide no basis for African majority rule, nor any guarantee of any unimpeded progress in that direction, and certainly of no speedy progress. It has been claimed that 100,000 Africans could register under the existing Constitution. This claim is not supported by any statistical or scientific survey—and even if one accepts this dubious figure it represents only about 2½% of the African population. Further, the facts are that in the last elections, in 1964, there were only 2,263 Africans on the "A" Roll and 10,466 on the "B" Roll—a total of 12,729, or 0.325 per cent of the African population.

Estimates have been freely thrown around to the effect that Africans could have majority rule under the present Constitution within 15 years. Other estimates put it as high as 50 years. Neither of these figures is based on any scientific analysis. If they are supposed to refer to the number of African voters on the "B" Roll, then the claim is valueless, since no matter how many Africans are on this Roll they can only elect under 24 per cent of the Members of the Assembly. If it is meant in relation to the decisive "A" Roll, then it is a false claim, since there is no way of estimating how fast the white minority will allow African annual incomes to advance towards the £330 minimum. Past experience shows that everything will be done by the settler government to prevent Africans ever advancing to a position of being able to exert their democratic will on the body politic of the country.

From what has been said above it should be clear that the African people are completely justified in refusing to work this fraudulent Constitution, and in demanding its suspension and the drawing up of a new Constitution based on the democratic principle of universal adult franchise or, to give it its popular term—one man, one vote. It is not out of place to recall, in this matter, that in March 1963 Mr. Wilson declared in respect of the 1961 Southern Rhodesia Constitution:

> "We have said that no constitution is defensible which fails to allow the people of those territories to control their own destinies. *We have bitterly attacked the Southern Rhodesian Constitution for that, and a Labour Government would therefore alter it*—we've made that very, very plain."

Mr. Wilson has now gone back on this pledge, as he has on so many others.

Constitutional Amendments and Reserved Powers

The final question is: Has the British Government the power and the possibility to change or suspend the Constitution?

The white settlers and their supporters make a dubious claim, based on past practice or "convention", that the British Government has no legal right to intervene. They further argue that the 1961 Constitution gives the Southern Rhodesian Government the right to amend the Constitution by a simple two-thirds majority of the Legislative Assembly—and, naturally enough, they are relying on the discriminatory electoral system prescribed in the 1961 Constitution to grant them their 50 seats out of 65—sufficiently more than the two-thirds figure of 44.

Prior to the 1961 Constitution, no amendments could be made to the Constitution of Southern Rhodesia without the approval of the United Kingdom. The 1961 Constitution did away with this absolute right, but laid down the following procedure. First, the Southern Rhodesian Government must

[6] See *African Advancement in Commerce and Industry:* by D. S. Pearson (Journal of Modern African Studies, August 1965; p. 245).

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

secure the British Government's approval for any amendments affecting

> "(a) the position of the Sovereign and the Governor; (b) the right of the United Kingdom Government to safeguard the position regarding: (i) international obligations; (ii) undertakings given by the Government of South Rhodesia in respect of loans under the Colonial Stock Acts."

Secondly, the 1961 Constitution gives the right to the Southern Rhodesian Government to make other amendments if it secures a two-thirds majority for these in the Assembly; but such amendments do not affect what is termed the "basic clauses". These basic clauses include Clause 12, which expressly forbids the elimination from the "A" or "B" Rolls of any person who was eligible for inclusion under the 1961 terms. If the Southern Rhodesian Government wishes to make such changes, it must, in addition to securing a vote of two-thirds of the Legislative Assembly, secure the agreement separately of "the four principal racial communities (i.e. European, African, Asian and Coloured)", the agreement to take the form of a simple majority of votes in a separate referendum for each community. "Until there are 50,000 Africans registered as voters, Africans over 21 years of age, who have completed a course of primary education of prescribed standard, will be entitled to vote in the African referendum." If the Government does not wish to hold a referendum, then it has to "seek the approval of the United Kingdom Government for the constitutional changes" it desires.

The incredible thing about this procedure is that, providing that the Southern Rhodesian Government can persuade or cajole 50,000 Africans to register, and can persuade or cajole 25,001 of these to support a worsening of the Constitution, then the Southern Rhodesian minority Government can do this.

But this procedure only covers what people are allowed to register for "A" or "B" Roll; it does not cover the question of the number of Members of the Legislative Assembly. "The Legislative Assembly, by a vote of two-thirds majority of its total membership, will have power to amend the composition of the Assembly" (*Cmd.* 1399—Para. 11). In other words, as Mr. Wilson admitted in the House of Commons when reporting on his visit to Southern Rhodesia (see *The Times*: November 2, 1965), "an independent Rhodesian Parliament, without check or constitutional hindrance", could reduce the "B" Roll seats from 15 to one or increase to 100 the "A" Roll seats, and thus postpone for many years the achievement of majority rule.

The African national leaders have stood firm, despite the considerable pressure and bullying to which they have been subjected. They have been faced with a virtual ultimatum: "Accept the 1961 Constitution or stay in detention." Mr. Wilson has not only refused to press for the release of the political prisoners, but has stated in the House that Mr. Smith was prepared to release the leaders provided that they gave a satisfactory assurance "that they would now revert to purely constitutional means of political activity". Mr. Wilson, when making this statement, must have been aware of the fact that practically every means of normal political activity is barred to the Africans; their parties have been banned, one after the other, over 35,000 people have been detained, publications have been suppressed, and meetings are restricted. In addition, a major form of political activity, voting, is denied to at least 97½% of the African people.

There remains only the question of the British Government's over-riding powers. In the *Report of the Southern Rhodesia Constitutional Conference* (*Cmnd.1291*) it states (para. 34):

> "The Southern Rhodesia Government asked that the United Kingdom Government should initiate legislation to provide that, in future, Parliament at Westminster would not legislate for Southern Rhodesia, except at the request of the Government of Southern Rhodesia, in regard to any matter within the competence of the Legislative Assembly."

The Report then ran: "The Secretary of State for Commonwealth Relations took note of this request without commitment." In other words, *the British Government did not surrender to the Southern Rhodesian Government Britain's power to legislate for Southern Rhodesia.* These powers indubitably remain with the British Parliament, which can either legislate for Southern Rhodesia or suspend the existing Constitution. Southern Rhodesia, from a legal standpoint, is still a colony, and the British Parliament still has sovereign powers to legislate for Southern Rhodesia. This has been underlined recently by Professor Stanley Smith, Professor of Public Law at the University of London:

> "The Rhodesian Legislature, even by a two-thirds majority, is incompetent to restrict the ultimate sovereignty of the United Kingdom Parliament or the powers of the Queen in Council by asserting that laws for Rhodesia cannot be operative there without the Rhodesian Government's consent. If it purported to impose such a restriction it would be told unambiguously that sovereignty was sovereignty and that bootstraps were bootstraps" (*The Guardian*, October 27th, 1965).

* * *

No tinkering with the 1961 Constitution will do, for what is at stake is a fundamental question of political power. Shall power continue to lie in the hands of a racialist, anti-democratic minority? Or shall it pass into the hands of a democratic majority? The best interests of the British and African people demand that it be the latter.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Problems of Soviet Economy

Lev Alter

THE October (1964), November (1964) and March (1965) Plenary Meetings of the CPSU Central Committee rejected subjectivism in economic activity and decided that to enhance the role of science in economic planning and management is a first-priority target. This requires a still closer association between economic theory and practice.

* * *

A major characteristic of economics in socialist society is its development in direct association with the practical planning of the national economy. Planning and economic activity, for their part, can and must rely on economics, which generalises practical experience and equips practice with new data, conclusions and recommendations.

Of major importance under contemporary conditions is the organic co-ordination of planning with the system of stimulating enterprises economically and encouraging employees materially in all sections of production. It is on this basis that we can achieve the correct combination of an integral national planning and the extensive development of mass labour activity and economic initiative everywhere.

The Law of Value

A certain gap in evidence in the past between planning and the principles of economic effectiveness and stimulation originated to a considerable extent due to the underdevelopment of the theory of the law of value in the socialist economy. For a long time the existence of this law under socialism was denied altogether. There were widespread concepts about the withering-away of commodity cash relations, relative unimportance of economic cost accounting (khozraschot) and profit principles, and the validity of the replacement of material stimuli by administrative-organisational methods. Formulated at that time, the propositions on the "transformation" and then "restriction" of the operation of the law of value implied its recognition but did not eliminate its underestimation. The law of value was regarded as an undesirable survival of capitalism and its stimulating role under socialism was much ignored. This interpretation corresponded to the theoretically fallacious propositions on the absence of commodity relations in the sphere of production of means of production, "higher profitableness" justifying enterprises operating at a loss, the need for restricting the operation of the law of value, etc.

In this case two different problems were mixed up: the actual restriction of the operation of the law of value because money cannot be converted into capital exploiting hired labour, and the stimulating role of this law which should by no means be restricted under socialism. On the contrary, it is under socialism, when the operation of the law of value does not lead to the poverty of the masses, and production is subordinated to the target of meeting the growing demand of working people, that this law may display its stimulating role to a full extent.

The fact that the law of value operates on the basis of the social ownership of the means of production and planned development of the national economy does not at all restrict the operation of this law as a stimulator of the economic activity of enterprises and material incentive of working people in the result of their labour. This aspect of the law of value must be used to the best advantage, which requires an organic co-ordination between the planning of the national economy and the levers of the economic effectiveness of production as well as the system of material stimulation.

Another aspect of the underestimation of the law of value was the failure sometimes to take into account to a proper extent the objective laws of the economic reproduction of manpower. From the fact that manpower is no commodity under socialism it was concluded that the value determination of the resources for the economic reproduction of manpower could not be applied to the socialist economy.

It is true that manpower under socialism is no longer a commodity. This follows from the domination of social ownership of the means of production and the elimination of exploitation of man by man. However, consumer goods in a broad sense necessary for the economic reproduction of manpower are commodities. They have definite values which constitute the economic form of manifestation and calculation of the conditions for the economic reproduction of manpower.

In socialist society there is no law of value of manpower, but there is an objective economic law of the economic reproduction of manpower. The value of the resources of the economic reproduction of manpower constitutes an objective basis determining the magnitude of that part of the national income which is spent on the remuneration of labour. A violation of the manpower economic reproduction law leads to an economic penalty.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The planning of the national economy must take into account all conditions for the economic reproduction of manpower, which implies the correct development of a proper system of remuneration for labour and material encouragement. The measures implemented at present to regularise the system of remuneration for labour (and especially the rise in the general level of the minimum levels of wages and the decrease in pay differentials between different categories of working people) will make this system correspond to the objective law of the economic reproduction of manpower.

The observance of this correspondence, with allowances for the fact that the amount of material and spiritual products which determine the value of the economic reproduction of manpower expands steadily as socialist economy develops, is one of the main targets for the planning of the national economy. Without this observance it is impossible to improve the remuneration for labour, the social funds of consumption, and the distribution of the national income.

Extensive work is in progress in Soviet industry to apply effective methods of economic stimulation. In particular, at several enterprises representing different branches, a new system of bonuses to engineers, technicians and office employees is being given an experimental try-out. According to this system, a bonus for each per cent of growth of production under the plan is higher than for each per cent of output over and above the plan. The same applies to qualitative indices.

Surplus Product

Of extreme importance in the system of economic stimulation is the correct application of the law of the output and distribution of the socialist surplus product. Wrong views about the absence of the category of surplus product in the socialist economy were formerly in currency for a long time. Hence followed the underestimation of the rate of profit in socialist production. Today it has been recognised in theory that the absence of exploitation of man by man and the socialist ownership of output do not rule out the division of this output into the necessary product, corresponding to the resources for the economic reproduction of manpower in the sphere of material production, and the surplus product over and above these resources. The latter product is known to be used for accumulation and the satisfaction of material and cultural needs. In practice it has also been recognised that the profitable operation of enterprises and the increase of the role of profit as an indicator of effectiveness of their productive activity are indispensable.

Nevertheless, the rate of profit has failed to take its due place either as an important criterion of the economic effectiveness of production or as an element in the system of economic stimulation of enterprises. Today this is explained not by the underestimation of the role of profit, but by the fact that no sufficiently effective method has been found for applying profit as an instrument of the state-level planning of the national economy and the planning of each branch of production. The methods of using the rate of profit as a lever of stimulation, proposed by some economists so far, were sometimes confined to enterprises. There is no need whatsoever to oppose the rate of profit and the entire system of economic stimulation to an integrated state-level plan, since the latter must be based on the utilisation of economic laws and organically incorporate the entire system of economic stimulation and cost accounting.

In socialist economy the rate of profit must be raised to the national-economic level, ruling out any opposition of the interests of a particular enterprise to those of society as a whole.

The methods of economic stimulation based on the utilisation of the rate of profit must organically combine not only with the plan for each enterprise, but also with the plans for each branch, each economic area, and the entire national economy. This, in turn, requires the further development of the specific forms of economic management. The latter must rely on the correct combination of administrative methods with cost-accounting at all levels.

No effective system of economic stimulation can be realised if cost-accounting is confined to enterprises. This restriction would contradict the level of socialisation of production under socialism, weaken the effectiveness of planned management, and lead to a discrepancy between administrative methods of controlling enterprises and the requirement imposed by cost-accounting on their activity.

A maximum use of all economic levers—profit, pricing, contracts, credit, bonuses and others—requires the extension of cost-accounting beyond the framework of enterprises and the conversion of cost-accounting into the basis of economic management and control.

The cost-accounting of enterprises must be complemented by the cost-accounting of production associations of the type of firms, trusts, etc. on the scale of economic areas, union republics and the country as a whole.

Lenin emphasised the importance of trusts as an objectively necessary legitimate form of the organisation of large-scale production in the socialist economy. " . . . Socialism (he wrote) is not an invention, but is the assimilation and application by the proletarian vanguard which has seized power of what has been created by trusts." Lenin put forward the target of "organising large-scale production of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the type of trusts". A higher level of the socialisation of production under socialism is expressed in that trusts and other cost-accounting units are linked into an integral system of nation-wide economic management, and their activity is directed and co-ordinated under an integral state plan. In our opinion, the establishment of such units will solve the problem of the maximum use of economic levers of socialist production on the basis of their organic combination with the integrated state planning of the national economy.

Operating under a national plan, integrated units will be able to study demand, take into account the customers' orders to determine the required outputs, including the range of products, manoeuvre the resources and redistribute them between enterprises, regulate the prices of their products within prescribed limits, effect a single technological policy in the corresponding branch and ensure a definite specialisation of production. Under these conditions the role of economic contracts and direct association between integrated units and enterprises will increase, and the main source for the assets of integrated units, including capital investment, will be their own accumulation plus bank credit.

The Pricing System

Of primary importance for strengthening economic stimulation and cost-accounting is a scientifically developed pricing system. In this field there is also a certain discrepancy between economic theory and the needs of economic practice. In theory two functions of the price are sometimes opposed: the function of the social evaluation of labour and measurement of the proportions in the national economy and the function of economic stimulation. Actually, these functions should not be separated, for the best instrument of economic stimulation and cost-accounting is that price which correctly reflects the expenditure of socially necessary labour on the production of goods. Only this price stimulates the reduction of production costs and ensures a normal profit rate for the enterprise (if, of course, the expenditures of the enterprise correspond to socially necessary expenditures). Conversely, practice has shown that a discrepancy between the price and socially necessary expenditures interferes with both functions of price.

According to the objective economic law of pricing, the price is made up of the costs plus profit or an element of profit used for various payments. All these elements are not the sources of the price but the forms under which its different constituents are manifest, while the price itself is a money expression of value, of socially necessary expenditures of materialised and living labour.

On the scale of society the relation of price levels must correspond to the relation of values. Therefore, scientific pricing must aim not at superimposing different payments on the price, but at determining the socially necessary expenditures of labour, expressed by the price. It is only on this basis that it should be established which price constituents compensate the corresponding expenditures and which make up the profit with all its elements and derivative payments.

The measurement of socially necessary expenditures of labour, including reduction, is a complex analytical problem which has not yet been solved. However, modern economics is equal to this task. In particular, an interbranch input-output table, taking into account the labour consumption of products, makes it possible to measure the total expenditures of living and materialised labour. The problem is essentially to determine the socially necessary expenditures of labour, taking into account their correspondence to both the level of the technical development of production and the social need for each kind of output.

Social Demand

Marxist economics recognise the immense role of taking into account correctly the social demand for, and social use-value of, goods in the mechanism of the operation of the law of value and pricing. In this connection mention should be made of an extremely important cardinal proposition of Karl Marx about a more developed expression of the law of value to which too little attention has been paid in our inquiries and discussions. "Social need, i.e., social use-value on a social scale", Marx wrote, "is what determines here the proportions of all social working time for different special spheres of production." Marxism-Leninism criticises the bourgeois theory of marginal utility not because it involves the category of utility but because of its treatment of this category in purely subjective terms rather than as an objective use-value, and because it ignores labour as the natural source of the value of goods.

The theoretical development of the above problems is of immense importance for economic practice, and especially for the pricing system. Prices are determined by labour values. This means that the levels and relations of prices must reflect the distribution of labour (socially necessary under given technical conditions and corresponding to demand and its pattern) between different branches of production. The prices of interchangeable goods must be established taking into account the expenditures of labour on meeting the same amount of demand of the same kind (for example, a calorific

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

unit of coal, oil and gas). Prices must also take into account the amounts of labour expenditures on goods depending on their quality.

Thus, taking into account social demand, social use-value is an indispensable condition for determining the socially necessary expenditures of labour on which pricing must be based. An interbranch input-output table whose second quadrant represents the "final demand", and the first and the third quadrants may express the labour consumption of outputs for different branches of production, can be used as a pricing technique.

Economic practice necessitates a further creative development of the labour theory of value, and especially the development of the problem of socially necessary working time under socialism, taking into account the technically justified level and structure of expenditures of labour within the limits which would correspond to the amount and pattern of demand. This is also one of the main problems of the theory of the optimum planning of the national economy, the development of which on the basis of the Marxist-Leninist theory of value and economic reproduction is an urgent problem of our economics.

The French Resistance

Frida Knight

IT is twenty years since the end of the World War Two, the capitulation of Germany and Europe's wakening from the nightmare of Nazi Occupation. This is an appropriate time to recall and pay tribute to the heroism of the people who played such an important part in bringing the war to a victorious end—the Resistance Movements of Europe.

In the case of France, a useful publication is the *History of the French Communist Party* (Paris 1964), which, although it condenses the story of the wartime resistance necessarily into two chapters, places it in its historical perspective. It explains why it was that, of all the French political parties, the P.C.F. was the only one ready, from the outset of the war, to take the responsibility of the underground struggle upon itself, to build up the popular movement of resistance to the Nazis and Vichyites, and to achieve unity with other groupings in a broad front which eventually became France's secret and undefeatable army of the Interior.

A more detailed study was published in 1960 (*Les F.T.P.* Guillard, Paris) which should be read or re-read now, to remind us of the debt we owe to the Franctireurs and Partisans, and to the Party which inspired them. Charles Tillon, who was Commander-in-Chief of the F.T.P., has made an exciting epic out of the history of the resistance; he describes the guerrilla campaigns, battles, acts of sabotage, individual and collective heroism of the ordinary people, he tells of international double-dealing, dark plots and counterplots, but all the time he sees the historical basis for events, and shows clearly how and why things happened as they did.

As Tillon's survey is valuable, and so much of the material is not otherwise available in English, it seems worth summarising it at some length; it sheds much light not only on yesterday's French patriots but also on the guerrillas of 1965 Vietnam.

Tillon writes in a lively style, often sardonically humorous, always vivid. The book is as compelling as a whodunnit, and one is left with the sensation of having been carried along through the years on a great wave, which began as a ripple and became a tidal surge of patriotic fervour in action. The wave spent itself after sweeping away a great evil, but it had shown the strength of the vast popular movement—causing its enemies to tremble and its friends to rejoice, even today.

The Resistance movement was born after the defeat of the French army in 1940. But its story could not be written without an explanation of France's position in the preceding years or an assessment of the relative social forces. In the nineteen-thirties, despite the "200 Families" and their financial power, French fascism and the Cagoulards had been routed by united popular action; in no other country in Western Europe was the working class so politically conscious, so well organised; no other labour movement had made such sweeping advances as the *Front Populaire* in 1936-37; no other capitalist country had so coherent and vocal a Communist Party, nor offered such a "threat" of left-wing government.

The forces of peace and social reform were so strong that the reactionaries of all parties closed their ranks, and, with the backing of Big Business everywhere, set about wrecking the Popular Front.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This was achieved—although many of the reforms and much of the spirit of the *Front Populaire* lived on—finally in early 1939, when Laval took over from Chautemps, with a truly "ultra" cabinet, ready to agree to any move dictated by international High Finance, and to carry out an anti-communist policy. Like Chamberlain, Chautemps and Laval wanted to allow Hitler a free hand in the East, to ensure that he left the West alone and eventually attacked the U.S.S.R.

The Soviet-German pact of August 1939 was a blow to their hopes, and they vented their anger on the French Left, making the pact an excuse for an all-out assault on democratic institutions.[1] Concentration camps for anti-fascists, the beheading of Trade Unions, the suppression of progressive newspapers, the arrest and trial of 26 Communist deputies, were part and parcel of the anti-Communist drive.

The declaration of war after Hitler's invasion of Poland was not followed by any effective action, but the people of France were issued with gasmasks and ration cards and assured that they were sufficiently protected by the Maginot Line. General de Gaulle was one of the very few army men realistic enough to doubt the efficacy of the Line, which stopped short at the Ardennes, and to call for mechanised modern weapons to be supplied to the army.

To mobilise the French troops and send them to sit in dug-outs for months on end without any action or purpose, was a sure way of demoralising them (as the High Command must have known). While the "poilus" sat waiting, the pro-fascist government planned the bombing of Baku, and the sending of an expeditionary force to Finland, but they were forestalled in this by the Nazi invasion of Norway and the collapse of the Mannerheim regime.

France Invaded

When the Wehrmacht invaded France, through Belgium, by-passing the Maginot defences, a panic was started in Paris; workers were ordered to dismantle the factories and travel on foot to reassemble them and resume work in the south. This incidentally meant that Trade Union organisations were broken up and dispersed all over the country, and united industrial action made almost impossible.

The dispersal of the workers, the appearance of streams of refugees and demoralised soldiers escaping from the advancing Germans, the rumours, orders and counter-orders, administrative chaos, along with fifth-column activity in preparation for a Nazi take-over, all contributed to the "collapse" of France. If a strong will to resist had been manifest, if any suggestion had been made that Paris should be defended, if the people's organisations had been given half a chance of participating in the country's battle, the history of 1940-45 might have been very different. But the government of "attentistes" was much too frightened of the popular forces and of the revival, in a patriotic struggle, of the late *Front Populaire*.

The tragedy of the exodus, of the occupation, of the Vichy set-up followed from the nature of the regime, which preferred to deal with Fascism rather than to save democracy in the company of "reds". The Armistice signed between Pétain and Hitler, dividing France into two zones (with the pretence that the one ruled by Vichy was "free") was the seal set on the conspiracies of the Cagoulards and fascists during the ten previous years.

The vast majority of the people of France watched the macabre charade with disgust, and, as anyone who was in Paris that summer well knows, although they seemed stunned, battered and gagged, they never accepted their defeat or acknowledged Pétain's government as legal.

De Gaulle betook himself to England, where Churchill gave him facilities to organise a fighting force and to broadcast and to send agents into occupied France. His speech of June 18th 1940, was an important landmark in the history of the war; but as Tillon points out, it was far from being the only factor in forming the Resistance movement. It was a rallying call to the country, and in particular to the bourgeoisie, with whom de Gaulle identified himself, and who had no other point of attachment as their political parties had disappeared in the debacle.

The Communist Party

The Communist Party alone (illegal since mid 1939) had never been dissolved, but had kept itself in existence through small underground groups. Throughout 1939 and '40 they were re-forming ready for action. This was evident to those of us who saw the words "Vive Thorez" and "A bas les Nazis—le P.C.F." chalked or painted on walls during that summer, or heard the stories already circulating about attacks and sabotage against the Germans.

Soon after the armistice the Communists were forming the O.S. ("Organisations spéciales") which engaged in widespread individual actions. The most urgent need, which was to be the constant preoccupation during the next four long years, was to acquire arms. Rifles, revolvers, tommy-guns, thrown away in the debacle, were recovered from the roadside, the reservoirs, the rivers; cartridges were picked up in the woods and carefully treasured against the

[1] "le gouvernement français entend transformer la guerre contre Hitler en une lutte contre le Parti communiste français." Histoire, p. 369.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

day when they could be used. By November a police circular reported that "the Communist Party had organised the picking up all over the country of arms abandoned by the French army, and were creating shock brigades of six to eight men" (p. 44).

Individual efforts led to the first nucleus of organised resistance in August 1940—twenty groups of three men in the forest of Darnetz, in Correze, headed by Jean Vallat, a former militant Trade Unionist, who was caught and savagely tortured by the Nazis but gave nothing away. Between July and October, the Feldkommandantur in Rennes, Fougères, Angers, Nantes, Rouen, and at Eure, published proclamations after the discovery of acts of sabotage, cutting cables and telephone lines by Communist militants.

From the very beginning of the occupation it is thus clear that the Communists were the moving spirits in the growing resistance to the Nazis. This was so because the Party knew that their position reflected that of the masses of ordinary French people, who were ready and willing to support them, and were drawn in ever greater numbers into activity.

de Gaulle's Plans

In the meantime, de Gaulle, having launched his appeal to the French people, was concentrating on reorganising what was left of the French army in Britain and overseas into a fighting force for future invasion. The idea of underground struggle was strange to the General; as he wrote in his Memoirs, "while consolidating our overseas bases, we were thinking of the metropolis, and what should be done there. How? What with? . . . the terrain of illegal action (in France) was entirely new for us. Nothing had ever been prepared there to meet the situation. . . ."

The General's idea of meeting the situation was for "trustworthy" men to be sent clandestinely into France to make contact with small groups of known supporters already existing.

Colonel Wavrin, known as "Passy", was charged, working alongside British Intelligence Service agents, with the mission of forming "réseaux", and the manner in which he carried out this mission was from the first a matter of suspicion to the patriots who had for many months been fighting in the underground movement.

Tillon insists on the importance, realised by the Communists, of the fact that "the resistance movement, seen from London, was an affair of the ruling class . . . not that of the working people" (p. 73). De Gaulle's "trustworthy" agent would not contact "reds", but "individuals and groups in circles not entirely dissociated with the Cagoule, which also had not put all its eggs in one basket. . . . From the moment de Gaulle put out his feelers into France, it was . . . to organise a Gaullist party, supported by the representatives of high finance, big business, Pétain's army, and the Vichy government officials" (p. 76).

In spite of this, throughout the four years of occupation, de Gaulle, with his London radio services, was an acknowledged figurehead and a voice through which precious news and encouragement reached millions of French people. The Communist Party knew this and was ready to work alongside Gaullist headquarters; but it was under no illusion as to the set-up, and it determined to extend its own organisation among the masses of France.

Working under extreme difficulty, its leaders isolated, physically out of touch with each other, the C.P. organised, explained, acted. Individuals had tremendous responsibility, and sometimes, inevitably, made mistakes—mistakes from which the whole movement learned. As Tillon reminds us, the Resistance was "created by men thrown into a situation where individual behaviour is of cardinal importance. The only way a man could win freedom was to link up with others to win freedom; to multiply the will to live, to see clearly, to fight in the dark so as to be stronger than the darkness."

We should never forget the heroism of these patriots, working, organising secretly, in the early months of 1941, under the shadow of reprisals, executions and mass arrests which the Germans imposed in answer to their activity. De Gaulle announced his disapproval of individual "acts of terrorism" but the patriots knew that it was only by such example and action that mass action could grow. And gradually as popular anger and discontent spread, other illegal organisations were formed, with their own newspapers and rules. They were only active in the Occupied Zone, accepting (contrary to the Communists) the fiction of a legal government in Vichy; but their aims were the same as those of the C.P., and by May 1941 the time was ripe for united action among all the resistance groups. The Communists took the initiative in organising a meeting of the leaders of the groups to form a "national Front for the liberation and independence of France". This *Front National* was to be the backbone of the resistance movement throughout the war, bringing de Gaulle the support he had hitherto lacked and had as yet done nothing to encourage among the working people of France.

Organised Guerrilla Warfare

With the creation of the F.N. the methods of the *Organisations Spéciales* became outdated, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

disciplined military action had to be envisaged. At first there were all sorts of difficulties and hesitations, owing to ordinary people's natural dislike of killing, to the Nazis' threat of reprisals, and to the lack of support from the Free French Radio in London.

As Duclos wrote in a report to the central committee of the P.C., those who opposed "individual action" were really recoiling from the struggle. They gave the abusive title of "terrorism" to "what was the beginning, however timid and hesitant, of the armed struggle of our whole people" (p. 111).

This was a terribly painful period when, as Tillon says:

> "it was essential in spite of everything not to give in, but to clench one's teeth and overcome all opposition . . . and advance to the organisation of a struggle without which it would have been impossible to form *l'armée sans uniforme*" (p.111).

Groups of guerrillas were banded into companies called *Franctireurs et Partisans*. The name of Franctireur recalled the memory of the fighters of 1870, who were a shining example to those of 1941. Once formed, the groups carried out attacks and sabotage ceaselessly. Mostly the partisans were young and idealistic, and when arrested and tortured showed extraordinary courage and fortitude. Instead of being intimidated by the taking of hostages, men such as 17-year-old Guy Mocquet, Timbaud, and Michels expressed pride when chosen for execution because they were Communists, sang the Marseillaise, and faced the firing squad at Chateaubriant with their eyes open.

Although the London Gaullists attempted to stop attacks on the Germans and the Vichyites because of reprisals, it was clear that the Nazis would take revenge for any resistance whatsoever—so, asked the patriots, were they to be forbidden any action at all?

London was recognising the Pétain government as legal, in agreeing with Vichy's policy of condemning attacks on the occupying forces. If France was still at war, it was surely perfectly legitimate for the guerillas to fight and destroy the enemy. If the F.T.P.F. disobeyed de Gaulle's directives and fought on, it was because there was no other way of preparing the ground for the Allied landings which the General promised (p. 123).

The German invasion of the Soviet Union in June 1941 caused a great stir throughout the occupied countries, and the Resistance movement in France leapt forward in numbers and activity. (It has been said that the Communists did not join in strength until the U.S.S.R. was attacked, but this is nonsense, considering that the P.C.F. had been ceaselessly active since the summer of 1940.) Several other factors increased people's understanding of the situation: the illegality of the Vichy government was revealed, as the Marshal's complete servitude to Germany became apparent. The formation of the "Légion", to fight under Nazi command on the Eastern Front, the increasing persecution of anti-Nazis by Pétain, the "camps de jeunesse" on the lines of the Hitlerjugend, the Gestapo-style *Milice*, all showed that the whole of France was under Hitler's thumb.

Perhaps the most important factor in mobilising the resistance was the "relève", the operation by which Laval attempted to supply French workers for the Reich's factories, in place of Germans mobilised for the Eastern Front.

To prevent the trains of workers leaving for Germany there were dramatic demonstrations at railway stations, where men and women lay down on the lines or climbed on to the roofs of carriages, giving the workers a chance of jumping off and getting away while the police were busy coping with the demonstrators.

Those who escaped *opération relève* went into hiding, and their fugitive bands formed the nucleus of the maquis which sprang up all over the country.

Meanwhile, in June 1942, de Gaulle had made a democratic speech and France Libre had become France Combattante. The P.C.F. was invited to send a delegate to London, and Fernand Grenier arrived in the autumn, thin and haggard from his experiences, to speak for the partisans and to broadcast the unbelievable bravery of "ceux de Chateaubriant" and countless unnamed heroes.

Anti-Communist Sabotage

De Gaulle promised Grenier support for the F.T.P., and gave him a portrait of himself (signed "à mon camarade") and Soustelle entertained the P.C.F. delegate to dinner, but, although discreetly veiled, anti-communism was the prevalent attitude in Carlton Gardens. Colonel Passy and Soustelle had been given the task of forming a Free French army in preparation for Allied landings in the distant future, and this demanded an elaborate anti-Red security organisation; curious police-type interrogations were carried on by sinister investigators in the cellars of the B.C.R.A.[2]

There were differences among the Free French and there were also sharp differences between the British, Americans and French, which led to much intrigue and counter-intrigue in London and later in Algiers, whither, after the North African landings in January 1943, the Gaullist Headquarters transferred itself (and where the Darlan and Giraud episodes caused

[2] B.C.R.A.—Bureau Central de Renseignements et d'Action, de Gaulle liaison and organisation machine, closely in touch with British I.S., using double agents often in Vichy circles (pp. 76-78).

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a good deal of speculation as to the intentions of the Allied Governments and the Free French in exile).

It is true that stirring speeches, proclaiming the General's faith in the French people, and orders to keep up the combat, emanated from the *Porte-Parole de la France Combattante* in London; but words were not followed by action, and the partisans waited in vain for what they needed more than eulogies and exhortations: weapons (p. 257). The High Command of the F.T.P. wired directly to the General, in July 1943, "We are short of arms and explosives . . . identity papers, money, documents . . . publicity material" (p. 239). Over and over again appeals had been made for these through the agents who had promised the necessary supplies, but without result. This particularly urgent telegram and an account which followed it of hundreds of sabotage operations, paralysing enemy troop movements, destroying transport and provisions, remained unacknowledged. Equally ignored were the F.T.P.'s proposals for a united organisation of the armed forces of the resistance.

> "The F.F.I. (Interior Forces) should be part of the Free French Forces of the exterior, with which they would form the base of a new national army" (pp. 238-240).

Tillon says (p. 256):

> "the attentiste and reactionary leaders, charged by de Gaulle as well as by the British and American governments to control the Resistance for their own (often conflicting) interests, increased their paralysing pressure," showing "hostility towards the F.T.P. which led them to pursue the mistaken tactics of organising large companies of maquis instead of encouraging widespread guerilla fighting."

The Commander-in-Chief of the F.F.I., General Koenig, formerly of the Foreign Legion, sat in London boycotting the underground struggle, and causing many losses and much delay by his orders which were obeyed at heavy cost by the F.F.I. in France.

The most tragic story among many resulting from this policy was that of the maquis of Glières, in Haute-Savoie, at the end of 1943. London Radio had called on the "refractaires" (men who had escaped the *relève*) to assemble on a high plateau, icy and snowbound, in the depth of winter, forming a company ready for the day of liberation. Unfortunately nothing at all was provided in the way of warm clothing and supplies. The 457 patriots suffered excruciating cold and hunger, short of shoes, warm clothes, food (and, of course, weapons) for three months.

From January onwards, the Vichy militia chief, Lelong, imposed a siege on the department; his forces surrounded the plateau, and the patriots waited in vain for the promised supplies of arms (if not food and clothing) to be parachuted to them. Their captain, Anjour, radioed to Algiers and London, "We'll do our duty, but must have help." On 26th March the Nazis, now in occupation of both zones, attacked the camp with planes and artillery, supported by 1,500 Vichy militia, 2,000 gendarmerie, 800 police.

The maquisards fought valiantly against hopeless odds and were almost totally wiped out, in a futile and unnecessary struggle.

The same thing happened to other big maquis groups, as the F.T.P. foretold. But the smaller, mobile guerrilla groups fought very successfully—they were like lumps of mercury, impossible to catch hold of, breaking up and forming again with lightning speed. They destroyed the enemy's communications, his supply stores, and his morale, constantly and swiftly attacking in his rear. But they never got enough support, or arms, or recognition from the "command" overseas.

The "Soft Under-Belly"

In the early summer of 1943, the Resistance fighters were cheered by the news of an Allied landing in Sicily, and even more so by the rising in Corsica, where local partisans took advantage of the low morale of the occupying Italian troops to attack all over the island. The Corsicans finally liberated themselves on October 5th, showing what could be done without waiting for the Allied armies, given the right conditions.

This also increased impatience in France, where people were hoping desperately for a real Second Front, or at least for word of its coming. The German grip on the country was too strong for them to go into action independently. Now completely occupied by the Wehrmacht, France was being bled white of food, raw materials and manpower. The *relève*, in spite of gallant efforts to sabotage it, was taking its toll of workers, and the hardships suffered by the population both in civil life and in the maquis was weakening their powers. The long and exasperating wait was due partly to the Allies' assumption that the partisans were not to be trusted, and to their reliance on conventional military methods to oust the Germans and take over France; the Russian and the German armies were decimating each other (which suited some Allied Top People very well); and the excuse was given that a frontal attack on the Nazi defences in Northern France would be premature and suicidal.

The Allied advance up Italy was bound to be slow: the "soft underbelly" was in fact the extremely spiky Appenine range, best suited to defence, and well used for this by the Germans, while the Italian

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

patriots fighting bravely in the enemy's rear were seriously hampered, like the F.T.P., by lack of weapons and Allied support.

However, the Second Front could not be put off indefinitely, and when it became clear that the Germans were near defeat in the East, and that the Red Army would soon be sweeping across Europe, it was decided that the time had come for a landing. In May 1944 there was a demand for the stepping up of maquis activities and a promise from London of increased supplies. As usual these fell far short of requirements or were delivered to groups hostile to the F.T.P. (and found unused after the Liberation!). The long list of sabotage operations and attacks in those weeks were carried out mainly with home-made explosives, and arms seized from the enemy.

On the eve of the landing General Koenig gave orders over London Radio that northern coastal towns should be evacuated, and that men should join the maquis in large camps (in spite of previous lessons) ready to support the Allied armies when desired.

In several cases the maquis camps suffered the same fate as Glières (Vercors being the most tragic case); and where the evacuation order was obeyed, confusion reigned, and panic was sown in the towns bombed by wave after wave of British and American planes.

That this strategy was wrong and unnecessary was shown at Marseilles, where the strong and numerous F.F.I. went into action within the town, and liberated it, forcing the Germans to surrender with high casualties, and taking masses of prisoners, while Allied ships were lying offshore.

The city of Lyons could have been set free in the same way if the F.F.I. had not been under Gaullist control and insufficiently armed: 300,000 men in the surrounding area were ready, according to a F.T.P. report—but only 8,600 had weapons. The insurrection was forbidden, and the majority of the Germans got away, after blowing up the bridges over the Rhône, and after Allied bombings had killed thousands of civilians (p. 432).

The Second Front

D-Day came, and General Koenig ordered the guerrillas to go into action ; the Normandy landings were hailed with exultation by the Resistance all over France, and the Franctireurs redoubled their attacks on German garrisons and transports. Then, on June 10th, came an order from London—"Freinez (Slow down) les guerrillas!" Luckily the F.T.P. were too busy to heed this, and the blowing up of railways and ambushing of Nazi convoys continued, so that the Allied armies were able to advance at an unheard-of speed throughout the countryside.

One tragic aspect of the period following D-Day was the American lack of military intelligence, which led to the destruction of several coastal towns by bombing-planes, with thousands of civilian deaths —whereas shelling the German positions from the sea, as the F.F.I. repeatedly requested, would have destroyed them without loss of French lives.

Another tragic aspect, but with a comic side, was the taking over of the administration of French towns by the Gaullist forces (who were allowed to land only in the rear of the U.S. and British armies) led by high-up brass of the former French High Command, who made sure that the *collaborateurs* were replaced by men who were "safe", i.e. not communist inclined. Some very absurd scenes were enacted, as when one pétainist préfet handed his coat over to the new bien-pensant administrator, saying "you'd better change the buttons, they're stamped with the Vichy francisque!"

The attitude of fear and contempt towards the popular forces of the resistance was shown particularly blatantly in the Allies' policy on Paris, where the underground movement was of course strongest and best-organised. In the American and British plans for their armies' advance eastward, the city was to be by-passed—it was "only a spot of ink on the map" according to General Bradley, and could be left till the autumn, when it would be surrounded, with the occupying Germans "closed in there"—"Paris Sandwich!" comments Tillon, adding that "the patriots were determined to rise before it was too late, for if Paris were encircled with a German army inside the pocket Paris would become a battlefield and a cemetery" (p. 458).

The Allies' plan also meant slow starvation for the Parisians: the food supplies of Normandy would be available for the armies, but not for the city, which had already altruistically cut its own lifeline by wrecking the transport system for the benefit of the Allies (p. 457).

However, the plan had to be changed when it became apparent that the good people of Paris had other ideas, and every intention of achieving their own liberation at the earliest possible date.

The Paris Insurrection

From May onwards the working people there had carried on constant anti-German activity in the form of strikes, sabotage of production, "go-slow" in the public services. All through the summer there were demonstrations: hunger marches through Paris by Committees of Women, huge processions on 14th July, constant rail and transport strikes, and in August a demonstration of 1,000 metro workers shouting "Bread!" and singing the Marseillaise.

Immediately after the landings, Trade Unions and factory groups were organised into sections for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the defence and liberation of the city. On hearing this, Laval went post-haste to Paris to attempt to form some kind of front to sign an armistice with the Allies, rather than risk an insurrection. Herriot, the old Radical premier, was dug out of his "residence forcée" and offered the job of fixing this up. Herriot, to his credit, firmly refused. Laval then tried through Nordling, the Swedish Consul in Paris, to negotiate the armistice which was essential if the people themselves were not to take over.

The story of the comings and goings between neutrals, Nazis, Vichyites, British and American intelligence agents, in an attempt at all costs to forestall a rising in Paris, is almost unbelievable. All these efforts failed, of course, owing to the speed and impetus with which the insurrectionary movement grew into an irresistible force. By the end of July the working people in the centre, and still more in the outlying zones of the capital, were organised into a mighty army for guerrilla warfare.

Tillon vividly describes the exciting days (August 20th-25th) which were the climax of the fighting, and the story does not lose by the considerable detail which brings home the excellent and meticulous organisation of the insurrection. It brings home too, the fact that the population were armed with home-made weapons, Molotov cocktails, paving-stones, and whatever people managed to seize from the Germans: for, as usual, the arms they needed were denied them: even the ingredients for making their own! Rol, the F.T.P. leader, got no answer to his urgent telegrams asking the B.C.R.A. for "thousands of detonators, Bickford wire, tons of plastic to make anti-tank bombs"—"Ten thousand grenades would be decisive", he wired. (Could this possibly have been a reason for the lack of response?)

While the battle for Paris raged in the streets, de Gaulle arrived at the Chateau de Rambouillet with plans to enter the city in state (though the Resistance was not told about it). On the way he had visited the Pope who had assured him that "France would always be the elder daughter of the Church" (p. 503) "as she had never ceased to be during the Vichy era." Incidentally, although Monseigneur Suhard had given Pétain his blessing, and the hierarchy was collaborationist, innumerable individual Roman Catholics and many country priests had played a brave part in the resistance—as a look at Aragon's poems will recall.

At Rambouillet, unknown to the F.F.I. leaders, the General received as his first visitors some curious characters, with laissez-passers signed by Parodi of the Provisional Government Committee, and by General von Choltitz of the Wehrmacht; Saint-Phalle, of the Red Cross; Rolf Nordling, brother of the Swedish consul who had previously tried to fix an armistice; Laurent, director of the Bank of Indochina. With them was a Baron Poch Pastor, a.d.c. of General von Choltitz, and (it appears) a double agent.

"All four" wrote the General in his memoirs (p. 368-69), "came from Paris on the night of 22nd August in order to obtain from the U.S. command the rapid intervention of regular troops."

Tillon indignantly comments that the whole future of State Gaullism is summed up in "ce microcosme rambolitain avec les germes de son pourrissement." By receiving this delegation, de Gaulle, says Tillon "had in his heart forever denied the Resistance" (p. 507).

On the 25th August Paris was free:

> "Rien n'est si beau qu'un linceau déchiré
> Paris, mon Paris, par lui-même libéré !"

wrote Aragon, voicing the general joy and emotion. And in spite of all the plots to save German generals the humiliation of giving in to the F.T.P. chiefs, von Choltitz was obliged to sign the surrender order in the presence of Rol Tanguy, the partisan leader, as well as of General Leclerc.

De Gaulle was also manifestly disgusted. When he arrived in Paris, "his first word to Leclerc was to exhale his anger with him, his rancour towards the popular insurrection which had overthrown the Germans in spite of his delegates' manoeuvres"; and the order was at once given to Préfet Luizet to broadcast the command "to destroy the barricades which he could not bear to see" (p. 513).

However sore the General felt, nothing could damp the jubilation of Paris at her liberation, shared by the soldiers "with and without uniform". Unfortunately the rejoicing was not to last very long: the next and last phase of the Resistance's history was to be enacted during the long slow months of mopping-up operations all over France. The F.T.P., who had hoped for recognition, arms, even uniforms, were asked to demobilise, and leave the fighting to the regular army. Their political pasts were investigated, and questionnaires circulated on the pretext that they were "a ferment of national disaggregation"! F.T.P. leaders were deprived of status and the F.T.P. groups broken up. De Gaulle was determined to take the Resistance leaders down a peg. Witness his declaration to the F.F.I. chiefs in Marseilles in September 1944: "You will take your orders from General Chadebec de Lacalde, and . . . he takes his orders from me. We must put an end to these irregular committees." As he said in his memoirs, "I gave the orders to dissolve the F.F.I., and ordered the War Ministry to send a regiment from Algeria to facilitate this" (Memoirs, Vol. 3, p. 17).

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

de Gaulle's Obsession

Such was de Gaulle's obsession about the people taking power, the obsession which sprang from his class attitude, which led him to deal with the Fascist Vichyites and the Nazis rather than the insurrectionary leaders. In the light of this it is easy to understand his whole political career, which has been dedicated to preventing an imaginary Communist plot.

Was there in fact any possibility of a Communist seizure of power? It had never been mooted by the C.P. through all the long years of underground struggle. The most that the Communists hoped for was a truly democratic regime, in the spirit of the national resistance movement, which would carry out the work of reconstruction and the establishment of peace, in the interests of the mass of the French people who had suffered and fought for so long.

It was true, and has been admitted by historians, that the Communists "not only constituted the most homogeneous and disciplined element of the resistance, but also the most numerous, many non-Communists having joined them in the Front National" (Michel: *Revue d'histoire de la seconde guerre mondiale*, no. 18, p. 91).

Naturally the P.C.F. had had a great influence through the underground press, which had carried on throughout the occupation—with the distribution of 48 million copies of *L'Humanité*, 12 million pamphlets, 2 million leaflets, and the many propaganda sheets of young people's, women's and ex-Servicemen's organisations.

All these had for the previous eighteen months consistently "explained the aims and means which had become common to all the resistance organisations, in spite of the B.C.R.A." But in none of these was there any question at all of a Communist plot or *coup* to seize power.

The insurrection, in which the Party had taken a decisive part, had been prepared openly, in full view of the masses of the people, because it could not have been carried out without them or gone beyond what they approved. The General and his friends must have known this; but haunted by the spectre of Communism, and impelled by anti-Communism, they set out to destroy the possibility of working-class unity, and with it the spirit and unity of the resistance organisations.

The anti-Communism which prevented arms reaching the partisans, and tried to ensure that they had no say in post-war government, was the same anti-Communism which brought about the defeat of France in 1940, and which today still exists in high places and key positions.

The General now talks less about "the Soviet menace" and about preferring the A-Bomb "to the loss of our liberty" than he did some years ago. The magic of the Gaullist legend is no longer so infallible that he can talk so blatantly, and he has very cleverly regained respect and even affection, by his "independent" attitude *vis-à-vis* the U.S.A.

His recent coolness to West Germany and his approaches to People's China have won him approval and given the impression that he is at any rate a realist. But basically he represents only himself and his class, the most hardbitten conservative, anti-popular capitalist class, from which the French people cannot expect any concessions without a fight.

They must still be on guard to preserve their rights, much reduced and still threatened after a decade of gaullist rule.

As Tillon concludes, fortunately for France her people, in spite of the disappointments and frustrations of the post-war period (and we must add, the uncertainties and dilemmas of the sixties), have not forgotten their strength nor the lessons they learned in the Resistance. In peace time as in war and occupation, if they can achieve understanding and unity and discipline they can win back the fruits of victory which were snatched from them in 1945—the control of their country, and the possibility of building peace and freedom and a happy life for themselves and the children of France. The present electoral coalition of progressive parties is a hopeful and welcome sign.

WORLD MARXIST REVIEW 1965 - No. 11

A. FARRARI, J. M. FORTUNY

U.S. Imperialism Declares War on the Peoples of Latin America

MAURICE DOBB

Tendencies in European Capitalism

F. NICOLON

West-European Integration: Trends and Contradictions

Price 2s. 6d.

from

CENTRAL BOOKS LTD.,
37 Grays Inn Road, London, W.C.1.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Freedom of Art

Bill Carritt

IN the light of experience since the war, both in the capitalist and socialist world, there is much to discuss about the Marxist approach to the arts. This discussion has been entered by Honor Arundel in a book called *The Freedom of Art*. It deals directly with a number of questions concerning the relation of artists to the society in which they live and about which they express themselves, and by implication the book also deals with a Marxist theory of aesthetics.

As introduction to an opening contribution to discussion of this book, I quote two paragraphs from a review by Arnold Kettle which appeared in the *Daily Worker*, for what he wrote concerns the contributors, who, I hope, will write in our columns.

He wrote as follows:

> "What the author is out to do . . . is to raise a number of questions which a Marxist approach to the arts must take account of."
>
> "I think it is well to make this clear; otherwise I can see a lot of discussion ahead based on a wrong premise—that this is intended to be a more or less definitive statement from the Marxist point of view."

Later in this review Kettle notes the author's observation that Marxist discussion of many problems has been held back by fear of saying something that might be less than the whole truth.

My contribution deals with two related questions: (i) according to what principles does a Marxist seek to appreciate and criticise a work of art; (ii) in seeking to explain why we enjoy art and to define the nature of the aesthetic experience, in what way does the Marxist explanation differ from the non-Marxist?

The majority of non-Marxist people who are interested to define the role of art in society and the nature of the aesthetic experience deny that political or philosophical views play any part in forming their views.

Marxists maintain that the fundamental ideas underlying our understanding of art are the same as those underlying the physical and social sciences. From this great division follow differences concerning art and politics.

To put it in more particular terms, the Marxist view is that just as economics help us to explain the economic conditions of the past and to make our economic plans for the future, so there is capable of being developed an analysis of the nature and function of art, a theory of aesthetics, which enables us to understand, enjoy and judge past and present works of art.

The fact that such a theory of aesthetics can help us to understand and enjoy art better, but will not help us to be better teachers of artists or creators of art, emphasises the great difference between creative work in the arts and sciences.

Because the philosophy underlying systems of ideas is fundamental to the understanding of any aspect of Marxism, I think this book should, however briefly, explain its significance. As it is, nearly every chapter contains observations, critical analysis, speculations and suggestions which open up the big issues and lead us back to fundamentals.

The assertion of the relationship between art and philosophy and hence with politics, constitutes, I think, the first principle of Marxist aesthetics. It follows from this Marxist approach that the critic sees each artist in his own time and judges his work in relation to his own society, the social political realities of that time and the current views of these relations. I think in this respect the Marxist approach does not differ from that of many non-Marxists, although the implications of this approach lead us to differences.

In seeing the artist in his historical setting, we ask not only what he had to express about those times, but even more how far his work reaches out of the past with meaning for our own times and the society we are trying to create. Indeed we evaluate artists according to their ability to express the "permanent" aspect of the human condition and human qualities.

There would be differences among Marxists, I think, about that passage of Honor Arundel's on page 80 where she deals with the fascination of violence and says that "we all have within us, though mercifully usually held in check, the impulses of destruction", implying that violence is a constant factor in the nature of man.

Certainly we are not born with dark impulses of destruction, but I think the conditions of foreseeable society are likely in greater or lesser degree to give rise to such feelings. What can be changed is the way in which we harness such feelings. But I am aware that many Marxists would assert that all "dark impulses" are the product within us of oppressive exploiting social conditions, and nothing else.

When we consider contemporary artists we tend to judge them by their response to and treatment of the atmosphere created by the great class and national movements of our times. We criticise them if their work is preoccupied with the bewildering

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

aspects of these great movements rather than with the revolutionary potential which is less obviously apparent.

Yet in Britain today, to demand of artists in general more understanding of the revolutionary potential of our times than the revolutionary movement itself has yet realised in practice, is to blame artists unduly for the level of political consciousness.

Most artists, Marxists assert, are inevitably the creatures of their times, reflecting the mood when struggle is apparently inert, and caught up in optimism when the people are on the move. But this consideration of the artist in relation to his time is qualified by another and more important aspect, which I see as a second principle of the Marxist approach; it is the consideration of the artist's role in exploring and revealing new aspects of the world around us and new relations between ourselves in the changing world.

The accelerating rate of change in the technical basis of our life has immediate and long term influence on human relations. These it is not easy to define, though ever more sociologists consider it. Certainly it is one of the functions of artists to explore the changes we make in our physical world and consequently in our human relations, to explain ourselves to ourselves and in so doing extend our power of understanding.

Honor Arundel gives an illuminating quotation from Picasso describing his aims in this respect:

> "When I paint, I try to give an image people are not expecting, and beyond that one they reject. That is what interests me. I always try to be subversive. That is, I give a man an image of himself whose elements are collected from among the usual way of seeing things in traditional painting and then reassembled in a fashion to make it impossible for him to escape the question it raises. I've never painted for the 'happy few'. I've always felt that painting must awaken something even in the man who doesn't ordinarily look at pictures."

As we know, this subversive approach to art offends people, even the very people who practice subversive politics; for sometimes Marxists do not like looking at themselves and their world in a new way. It disturbs, alarms and makes them angry.

Marxism in art as in politics helps us to seek out and evaluate the significance of what is new; it should help us to appreciate the experimentation of artists in content and style.

Our own experience in the past should make us nesitate to condemn that which at first shocks. I can remember as a small boy being taken to see pictures of Van Gogh by my father, who was a teacher of aesthetics, and being embarrassed by his loud explosions of disgust. Many years later when other visual experiences had acclimatised him, we went to see the famous exhibition after the war, and he enjoyed the pictures.

In another context, Honor Arundel quotes Van Gogh on his explorations of technique:

> "My great longing is to learn to make those incorrectnesses, those deviations, remodellings, changes of reality, so that they become, yes untruth if you like . . . but more true than the literal truth."

It is much easier to look back and criticise others for not understanding what one has already mastered, than to practise creative criticism in respect of new developments and the strivings of contemporary artists.

I do not estimate very highly the dramatists Pinter or Beckett, but I am sure that they are seeking to deal with an aspect of our life which has for a variety of reasons assumed special significance, namely our inadequacy in trying to share our thoughts and feelings with each other. I disagree with the way they imply the eternal nature of this malady, but I am moved by the way they reveal it.

Tolerance

Not only should Marxist critics be tolerant of the explorations of artists, but they should also accept that artists like everyone else sometimes need to play within their own medium and make mock of themselves and others. In a socialist society this should mean that the institutions, the publishing houses, producers, galleries and museums provide the necessary opportunities for artists to produce their work without always having to be understood or immediately to please.

Because this book does not deal with it, I do not think our discussion should neglect the consideration of what sort of objects or qualities excite in us those experiences which we describe by the term beautiful or some such term. The desire to define the nature of this experience arises out of our natural curiosity about the nature of art and its influence on the lives of men. Because of our great need for it, we want to know why art enriches us and what is the common significance of the various forms which do so.

Ernst Fischer, in his book *The Necessity of Art*, asks why people need art as a form of recreation. He suggests that it is because all of us want to escape from our own limitations and enter into the actions and feelings of others, like or unlike ourselves. We are able to enjoy and be enriched by this extension of our own life, because the work of art makes accessible unknown worlds, and also deepens the sense of reality of our known world.

A work of art by making a new sense of our own experience gives us more understanding of the world around us. It is in part this power of all the arts to give significance to and expand experience which we describe as beautiful or some such term.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Discussion contributions on:

Changes in Wages Structure

Dennis Goodwin

BERT RAMELSON'S article is to be warmly welcomed as an important and much needed pioneering study in the future of wage structure in a period of rapid technological change. His central thesis—that a wage structure based on payment by results accorded with the interests of the main body of the employing class in the period when continuous use of manual skills was essential to the "most profitable" use of the new machines; but that PBR operates against the interests of maximum profit, as automation and near-automation is introduced—is in my view unchallengeable.

However, many complex problems arise when one attempts to lay down a general approach for a new pattern in wages structure which workers and their unions should pursue.

These complications arise from the uneven pace in the introduction of automation and near-automated processes; the relationship between PBR and exploitation; the political and industrial repercussions of agreements negotiated in the most advanced industries, on the working class as a whole; the dangers of new patterns of wages structure in the most technologically advanced industries separating off the workers in these industries from working class struggle as a whole and leading to a fresh development of sectionalism.

Thus, while agreeing with Bert Ramelson's general analysis, I have reservations on the final section of his article in which he "sets the stall out" with firm recommendations for collective bonus on a plant, pit or shed basis as a major part of wages structure in the future in the manufacturing and extractive industries.

Some Experiences

Experiences in the main tend to confirm the article's analysis.

In *Electricity Supply*—perhaps the most highly automated and capital intensive industry in the country—the so called "status agreement" provided a major increase in the basic rate and some fringe benefits in return for major concessions—crucial for the cheapest and maximum operation of the technologically highly advanced plant—in shift work, in overtime, removal of demarcation, reductions in manning, mobility of skilled labour. The profitability of the industry has soared to an equivalent of £17 per week per worker, an enormous capitalisation (£3,000 million) has taken place, relatively cheap current to private industry provided, with a perspective of further dramatic productivity increases, but the workers in the industry sharing in them only to a minimal extent.

In *Oil Refining and Distribution* the Esso Fawley agreement has been followed by the Shell Corytown agreement, hailed by the TGWU as one of the best agreements it has ever negotiated. Here again what would appear as a dramatic increase in the basic rate up to 32 per cent has been negotiated in return for unpaid overtime working (with availability of overtime essential to the operation of the highly advanced technology) and other productivity requirements.

Placed alongside the profitability of Shell Transport of £46 per worker per week it is clear that the share of the Shell workers in increased productivity is also minimal.

In *Print* a revolution in wages structure is under way, pioneered by the new agreement between the unions and the International Publishing Corporation. In return for increases in basic rates of pay of up to £6 per week and not unimportant "fringe" benefits—holiday pay at average weekly earnings, sick pay, etc.—the way is cleared for the full and most profitable operation of the revolutionary new machines and techniques in the industry.

> "All machines will run at maximum speed with Management varying the numbers engaged on any operation where common sense dictates . . ."
> ". . . no restrictions on the period of overtime and night work, no restrictions on the numbers employed on a shift . . ."

are but two of the typical clauses in the agreement.

With the profits of the IPC already up to 23% of the employed capital *in one year* and before the impact of the new far reaching agreement, it is clear that despite no doubt very hard bargaining by the unions on the present agreement, productivity increases are going to far outstrip increases in pay and improvements in working conditions.

Many other examples, confirmatory of Bert Ramelson's thesis, could be quoted—e.g., the new I.C.I. agreement; the Seamen's "56 hours at sea"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

agreement, etc. The ship repair employer's proposals for a new wage structure completely eliminate payment by results, etc.

On the other hand, the Devlin report on the Docks industry, which envisages forced concentration, massive mechanisation and technological development, and accepts the idea of a much higher guaranteed basic wage, in return for major productivity concessions by the men, is at great pains to point out that the guaranteed wage must not be "so high as to provide a *disincentive* to piecework".

In fact a major discussion is going on among the employers on wages structure and there is by no means uniformity of view.

Differences Among the Employers

In the past two years there has been a strong shift of opinion among the employers in favour of "plant" bargaining as the logical area in which income can be related to productivity, with Fawley, Linwood, etc., as the model.

The younger Tories are all for it and Mr. Howell, director of the Conservative Political Centre, has espoused it. It is the official policy of the Liberal Party. Aubrey Jones, Chairman of PIB, seems to come down in favour but with reservations.

But now discordant voices are being raised from the monopoly capitalism side.

The main objections seem to be: Plant negotiations are a major cause of "wage drift" and consequently inflationary pressure: they give the unions too much opportunity to play off one employer against another: a better purpose would be served by a "flexible national rate", and a flexible approach industry by industry.

None of this, of course, necessarily invalidates or weakens the arguments and proposals for a new P.B.R. collective bonus wage structure advanced by Bert Ramelson. But I think experience does indicate some big problems.

Some Problems of a New PBR Structure

1. *Is collective bonus the answer?*

The virtue of this method under conditions of automation, or very rapid technological development, is that it brings into the wages structure a built-in element ensuring *some share* for the worker of the value of rapidly—sometimes dramatically—increasing productivity. But it by no means follows that exploitation is decreased. On the contrary, it can be very much increased. All depends on the kind of agreement negotiated.

For example, let us assume a production unit operating without PBR with total value of production 10,000, variable capital (wage bill) 2,000, surplus (profit) 1,000. Rate of exploitation $= \frac{1,000}{2,000} = 50\%$.

As a result of major technological advances production goes up to 15,000. PBR brings an increase of 25% in earnings up to 2,500 (or perhaps up to 50% if as a result of the new processes the labour force is cut). But the surplus has increased, say, to 2,500 also as a result of new techniques cutting cost. Then the rate of exploitation is $\frac{2,500}{2,500} = 100\%$. Earnings have gone up by up to 50%, but the rate of exploitation has doubled.

Monopoly capital might be well prepared, faced with trade union pressure, to accept such a situation.

2. *What about periods of recession?*

The greater the element of wages made up by a productivity factor, the greater the danger of a major decline in the pay packet in periods of economic recession. Traditionally, the trade unions fought to raise basic rates to the maximum in periods of full employment and labour shortage, among other things as a safeguard to wages in periods of labour surplus and recession. Unless there are major changes in national policy the danger cannot be ruled out of a repetition in Britain of the massive growth of so-called "technological unemployment" such as has taken place, persists, and grows, in the United States. Here it is worth noting the downward pressure on wages in the U.S. resulting from this, with increases in earnings lagging behind even the very small increases in Britain.

3. *"Plant bargaining" and "Plant outlook"*

Here is a problem which I would like to raise rather more tentatively.

Is there a tendency for plant bargaining, *if it becomes the predominant form of the wages struggle*, to develop a "plant outlook", the idea that all problems are to be solved at plant level, that the T.U. branch no longer has relevance or importance, the national pay claim not worth bothering about, in short even though limited gains are made at plant level, fresh impetus is given to the growth of a sectional, parochial, outlook?

In this connection it is worth recalling Mr. George Woodcock as reported in the then *Reynolds News*, 31.5.59:

> "If I were an active trade unionist again you wouldn't find me anywhere near a branch; there's not enough done there to justify attendance."

I readily agree that the development of sectionalism is not inevitable; and plant bargaining has a major part to play; but the danger is very real. A *class* outlook, which the struggle against monopoly involves, in the field of wages as in all others, requires a *national* approach. The battle for the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

national agreement will remain a key question. Otherwise gains made at plant level will be more than wiped out by concessions, inadequacies, betrayals, at national level. And the best organised, best paid, in the technologically advanced industries, could abandon responsibility to help lift up the *whole class* position, including the low paid, unorganised, in the technologically backward industries.

What kind of wage structure to meet the development of automation and the technological revolution?

As a further contribution to the very important discussion opened up by Bert Ramelson, I make the following suggestions:

1. A wages structure for this period must have the aim of (a) ensuring the workers benefit in all productivity increases; (b) reducing the rate of exploitation. Insofar as PBR in the form of collective bonus is a suitable form of achieving this, all such schemes must aim to ensure a *continuing and increasing* share, where it is not immediately possible to secure for the workers a *major share* of the value of productivity increases. Otherwise the rate of exploitation will grow.

2. The highest possible basic rate in all industries, with equal pay for equal work, must remain at least *of equal importance* with new developments in PBR. The unions should not be deterred from this by the fact that some monopoly employers have increased basic rates rather than agree to PBR schemes.

3. There are important forms in addition to a bigger pay packet, in which workers can insist on a major share in the value of increased productivity. The seven-hour day or the six-hour shift without loss of pay is one such major advance possible, although wages remains the key.

4. Wages structure changes must not be made the basis on which major schemes for increased productivity are negotiated without reference to, and democratic decision by, union members, conferences, executives, and in which concessions are made which far outweigh advantages.

5. The national agreement, defending the interests of all—those in technologically more backward plants as well as the most advanced—must remain a key question for *all*.

6. At the same time, there must be no "creeping automation" in which major new technological changes are introduced at plant level, without negotiation and agreement, item by item, on how the workers will benefit.

* * *

I believe such a flexible approach is in accord with the type of development and problem already facing sections of the working class and that will face them more and more in the coming decade.

Paradise Lost and the Puritan Debacle

Raymond Southall

IN an essay devoted to Bunyan it was impossible to expand observations made *en passant* to Milton. However, when I remarked that Milton had fashioned the consciousness of polite society from the eighteenth century onwards, as far as might be judged from poetry, I was merely alluding to received opinion. The evidence is plain enough for anyone who wishes to consult it: Pope, whom Leslie Stephen described as "the authorised interpreter of the upper circle", relies heavily upon Milton in *The Dunciad;* Johnson, the grand old Tory, maintains that those who "lessen the reputation of Milton, diminish in some degree the honour of our country" (whose country?); Addison gives Milton his approval and Milton's daughter financial support; Thomson imitates Milton because, as James Sutherland remarked, "Milton helps him to express, in a way that the eighteenth century will accept, what he wants to say"; Byron's admiration for Milton stemmed from his greater, aristocratic, admiration for Pope—one recalls that Marx thought it "fortunate that Byron died in his thirty-six year, since if he had lived he would have become a reactionary bourgeois". But what, I am asked, of Keats? Simple: Keats threw aside Milton because, as he put it, Milton was death to him.

Milton's reputation had been part of the very fabric of a polite and gentlemanly world of letters since the eighteenth century: to call his poetry into question was to begin to take apart that fabric. The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

characters of some of the chief combatants in the critical hostilities that broke out around Milton in the twenties and continued through the thirties and forties reflect the more fundamental issues at stake. The protagonists, C. S. Lewis and E. M. W. Tillyard, belonged to the polite and gentlemanly world that had been shattered on the Somme; the antagonists, Eliot (initially) and Leavis, were rather like the tough-minded, practical men drafted into the Army to do a job who scorned the spirit of sportmanship in which the old regulars approached the task. Literature, like war, took on a new seriousness in the twentieth century, a seriousness that could not be contained within the terms of the old gentleman's agreement. To praise Milton was necessarily to praise the effect he had upon the capacities of those who read him. It was no longer a question of whether Milton was great, but of whether his influence—an influence grounded in the very nature of his achievement—crippled and distorted the sensibility, befogged the mind, choked up the channels of response to life.

The Circumstances

The appreciation of Milton is still a matter of lively interest (as witness the controversy my article occasioned) and it centres upon *Paradise Lost*. Milton's long preparation for a great epic attempt is well known; so too is his rejection of an Arthuriad and his decision to take the Fall as his subject. The story was familiar, not from reading the Bible (as my critics have claimed; Milton's story is not the biblical one) but from reading Chronicle histories such as Raleigh's *History of the World*. In this sense at least *Paradise Lost* does not pursue "Things unattempted yet in Prose or Rhime". Neither, considering the immense body of apologetic and interpretation that had grown up with Christianity, was there anything new in Milton's hope

> That to the highth of this great Argument
> I may assert Eternal Providence,
> And justifie the wayes of God to men.

If that hope had newness it must have been borrowed from the historical circumstances in which Milton produced the poem rather than from the general nature of the task itself. My critics are right in calling attention to these circumstances, but wrong in appraising their relevance to the poem because they ignore the actual quality of Milton's writing. There was a particular historical need to justify the ways of God to men and to assert Eternal Providence and that need was created by the collapse and overthrow of the Puritan Reformation, the failure to build Jerusalem in England's green and pleasant land. I am by no means suggesting that any such need was present to Milton's mind, merely that the circumstances created in the Puritan consciousness a new preoccupation with the ways of God towards men. That God had once again forsaken his chosen people in their hour of triumph was an awareness which left the Puritan mind groping for explanations, blindly seeking to exculpate the Lord, searching their own actions for sin, and dazedly looking about the ruins of their Jerusalem for the cracks through which Satan had made his entrance.

Milton's Style

It is in terms of this bewilderment, this groping for an explanation, that one can best appreciate Milton's style and see most clearly its connection both with the circumstances in which he wrote and with the task he set himself in *Paradise Lost;* the poem, in short, realises the basic preoccupations, and the state of mind in which these were pursued, not of one lonely individual, but of a multitude of men and women. That Milton was particularly well-suited to this task goes without saying; the style of *Paradise Lost* is not merely the creation of the immediate circumstances I've described; a glance at his earlier poems reveals the presence of the same personality, although the later poem shows a development of the traits noticeable in earlier poems. The best one can say of the relationship between Milton's style and the circumstances in which *Paradise Lost* was written is that certain elements of his personality, his style, were strengthened and began to predominate as a result of his own experiences—the experiences of a Puritan in the collapse of his hopes, his isolation, his sense of defeat at the hands of God.

Milton's faith, like that of the multitude of Puritans, remained un-shaken; in evidence of which we have the immense confidence of *Paradise Lost;* that confidence we detect immediately in the lines already quoted. It is a confidence more widely present in the seriousness of Milton's Grand Manner. But working within this large confidence are those peculiarities of style mentioned above: the groping for explanation of a sentence such as the following (from Book VIII):

> When I behold this goodly frame, this World,
> Of Heaven and Earth consisting, and compute
> Their magnitude—this Earth, a spot, a grain,
> An atom, with the Firmanent compared
> And all her numbered stars, that seem to roll
> Spaces incomprehensible (for such
> Their distance argues, and their swift return
> Diurnall) merely to officiate light
> Round this opacous Earth, this punctual spot,
> One day and night, in all their vast survey
> Useless besides—reasoning, I oft admire
> How Nature, wise and frugal, could commit
> Such disproportions, with superfluous hand
> So many nobler bodies to create,
> Greater so manifold, to this one use,
> For aught appears, and on their Orbs impose
> Such restless revolution day by day

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> Repeated, while the sedentary Earth,
> That better might with far less compass move,
> Served by more noble than herself, attains
> Her end without least motion, and receives,
> As tribute, such a sunless journey brought
> Of incorporeal speed, her warmth and light:
> Speed, to describe whose swiftness number fails.

This is Adam, following up his declaration to Raphael that "Something yet of doubt remains" with a sentence that gropes about amongst a mazy labyrinth of observations and qualifications seeking to express his perplexity. The sense of a man searching for what it is that is troubling him, seeking to put his finger upon a nagging but elusive worry, renders itself also in slight particulars; in that attempt, for instance, to concentrate attention upon the insignificance of the Earth—"a spot, a grain, an atom".

This perplexity, created by the actual quality of Milton's writing, magnificently characterises Adam at this point; an Adam teased by a doubt which he has difficulty in formulating. But the fineness of the passage, the fineness with which Milton realises this perplexity, is due to Milton's own perplexities; he is, that is to say, realising his own predominant state of mind and, indeed, that which afflicted the faithful Puritans at the withdrawal of God's grace from the Good Old Cause. That what is in this one passage a relevant perplexity is a quality of Milton, of his style, may be judged from such another passage as that in which (in Book 1) Satan addresses Beelzebub: "If thou beest he—but Oh how fallen", etc. It is possible, although the possibility here is weak, to argue that the confusion in this passage is also relevant, since it serves to characterise the confusion of defeat. The Satanic host arrive in Hell, it might be said, in ill order and this ill order reveals itself in the very speech of Satan himself. Doubtless some such case could be made out for the majority of examples one would wish to cite in order to illustrate the confusion and perplexity of Milton. But this must lead one on to urge that perplexity and confusion are of the very substance of *Paradise Lost*.

Milton's Humanism and Galileo

Within this confusion, however, there are certain imperatives; that they are not those of a humanist, especially not those of a Galileo as Daphne Simon claims, is perfectly plain. For instance: the doubt that Adam voices to Raphael develops into a disquisition upon astronomy in which the Ptolemaic hypothesis, that Earth is the centre of the universe, is weighed against the Copernican hypothesis, that it is not. The conclusion arrived at, and with which Adam expresses satisfaction, is:

> Solicit not thy thoughts with matter hid:
> Leave them to God above; Him serve and fear.

Strange humanist doctrine this from a friend of Galileo! Stranger still when in Book IX the old geocentric view of the universe is accepted without comment.

The discussion of astronomy is not, as some have claimed, irrelevant to the basic preoccupations of the poem. It offers a solution to the problem of doubt:

> . . . thus Adam cleer'd of doubt, repli'd.
> How fully hast thou satisfied mee, pure
> Intelligence of Heav'n, Angel serene,
> And freed from intricacies, taught to live,
> The easiest way, nor with perplexing thoughts
> To interrupt the sweet of Life, from which
> God hath bid dwell far off all anxious cares,
> And not molest us, unless we our selves
> Seek them with wandring thoughts, and notions vain.

What the discussion offers is a suggestion as to how these 'intricacies', 'perplexing thoughts', 'anxious cares' and 'wandring thoughts' may be stilled: "Leave them to God above". Here, then, with the anxious and wandering thoughts of a mind groping to understand the ways of Providence we are involved again in the psychology of the Puritan debacle. The advice offered reflects the quietism that had invaded some sections of the Puritan movement; as Petogorsky observed, "if the practical efforts of mortals had failed to achieve the desired results, surely God, in His time, would bring the eagerly awaited millenium".

Abstraction

Between the quietistic confidence and the perplexity there is an obvious incongruity. And this incongruity is of the very substance of Milton's poetry in *Paradise Lost*, as Macaulay perceived when, in his essay on Milton, he referred to:

> The peculiar art which he possessed of communicating his meaning circuitously through a long succession of associated ideas, and of intimating more than he expressed . . .

an art, Macaulay concludes, which "enabled him to disguise those incongruities which he could not avoid". Whether or not Milton could have avoided them is irrelevant to a judgement of the poem; they are there, partially disguised by his style, "communicating his meaning circuitously through a long succession of associated ideas", what I would describe as his perplexed groping after some satisfactory conclusion. That the discussion between Raphael and Adam on the subject of astronomy actually reaches a satisfactory conclusion is doubtful; if the reader is satisfied with it it is because he has been discouraged by the circuitous nature of the expression from paying serious attention to it; his attention has been *abstracted*. And, to arrive at a general observation from this particular one, one can say that the satisfaction given to the reader, like that given to Adam, relies upon the absence of serious attention; in more general terms still, that the con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fidence of Milton, that pervading confidence that sounds in the sonorousness of his language and the forward sweep of his rhythms, is supported by no particular attention to the matter in hand. The roll of the poetry has an assurance that derives from faith, faith in the conclusion towards which it so confidently moves; the fumbling logic, the lack of particular grip upon the argument, derives from a failure to provide any rational support for that large faith. Johnson said of metaphysical poetry that at least in order to read it you had to be able to think; in the case of Milton it is an advantage to the poetry if one is unable to think (or, at least, to think clearly) and this advantage is one that Milton's style seeks to procure.

Such remarks as these need to be appraised not only in the context of a present concern—how good is Milton's poetry?—but simultaneously within the context of that crisis of Puritan consciousness to which I have referred throughout. It is not difficult to see that for a Puritan in such circumstances the failure of the Puritan Reformation could ultimately be traced to a weakness in human nature, to man's liability to err, or sin as he would more forthrightly have called it. It isn't difficult either to see that such a conclusion provided polite society with its own opinions of the Revolution.

Finally, are we really meant to take seriously the claim that *Paradise Lost* is an allegory? That Adam is rebellious man, living on after his fall buoyed up by the promise of another chance to clear himself with the Establishment? Certainly polite society would have agreed and agreed also that Satan personifies the spirit of the Revolution, for Milton turns from implicit respect for Satan to implicit vilification of him in the course of *Paradise Lost*.

The Laws of Dialectics

Emile Burns

IN the November issue of *Marxism Today*, Maurice Cornforth raised "Some Questions about Laws of Dialectics". Before he deals with laws of dialectics, he describes other kinds of laws, and says much that I would not think of disputing. But some of his earlier statements seem to me to show a certain departure from the materialist outlook, which is even more pronounced when he passes on from other kinds of laws to laws of dialectics.

He says for example:

> "When it comes to laws of logic and mathematics, the first difference to note from the other laws is that it is not possible even to *imagine* anything happening which did not accord with them."

But he himself says later that laws of logic and mathematics "have to be *discovered* by us." If this is admitted, many previous generations of human beings must have been able to "imagine" things which did not accord with these laws, and if today Maurice Cornforth finds it impossible to imagine this, surely it is only because such discovered laws have been so often tested in experience and found correct that anything else has become "unimaginable" to the present generation.

In *Anti-Dühring*, Engels tells how the discovery of the differential calculus caused "convulsions" among the mathematicians of the time, and adds:

> "Ultimately these gentlemen—or those of them who had not died in the interval—grudgingly gave way, not because they were convinced, but because it always produced correct results" (p. 151, Lawrence and Wishart edition).

The test, the proof, of any law, whether mathematical or otherwise, is whether or not it produces "correct results", results that are in conformity with objective reality. As science advances in every field, it establishes things which would cause "convulsions" among preceding generations (and often even in the current generation). It discovers new laws which, when knowledge of them has been wisely diffused, are the basis on which most of us come to think that any violation of them is unimaginable. That is why, for example, the "flat-earth" theory has today become unimaginable.

The same point arises when Maurice Cornforth draws a distinction between natural laws, which cannot *in fact* be altered, and logical and mathematical laws, which "we cannot even *imagine* being altered". When we disobey these latter laws, "we make mistakes, of the sort which result in inconsistency or in reaching the wrong conclusions".

What does reaching the wrong conclusions mean? Surely it means reaching conclusions which do not conform to reality? The test of whether the laws of logic and mathematics are true or not rests on whether they conform to reality (from which Maurice Cornforth admits they are drawn), and not

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

at all on whether we cannot "imagine" violations of them, which is a historical question of the growth of man's knowledge.

On the same grounds I would also challenge the statement that laws of logic and mathematics are not "laws about what takes place . . . but laws to regulate our arguments and calculations about what takes place".

Here again I would refer to Engels, who says that although "in a more limited way formal logic or elementary mathematics can be regarded" as "a mere instrument through which things can be proved", yet "even formal logic is primarily a method of arriving at new results, of advancing from the known to the unknown. . . . It is the same with mathematics" (*Anti-Dühring*, pp. 150-151).

In other words, the laws of logic and mathematics are not *merely* to "regulate our arguments and calculations", but because they are drawn from objective reality they can also give us more information about "what takes place" in objective reality.

The Test of Objective Laws

In this section of his article Maurice Cornforth says that objective laws (of nature and society) "are to be *tested in experience*," and that "they must always have the logical character of being *falsifiable*." He dismisses the theory that God created and governs the world as "no scientific theory—for there is no way of testing it. . . . It is a mere fantasy, incapable of test."

He goes on:

> "In contrast to laws of nature, laws of logic and mathematics are not empirical. We derive them from experience, but we do not test them in experience like empirical laws. . . . They are not to be tested by whether what particular arguments or calculations lead us to expect actually happens—for if it does not happen, that does not show that the rules are wrong but rather that the argument or calculation proceeded from wrong premises."

But does not this particular excuse—for "whatever happens" in the real world contrary to what you expected—also apply in the case of natural laws, if you proceed from wrong premises?

It seems to me that Maurice Cornforth, in his anxiety to bring in subjective tests instead of objective tests, makes a false distinction between natural laws and laws of logic and mathematics, from the standpoint of how they are tested. The test of any law is "experience", objective reality. Some laws can be directly tested by experiment—but not even all natural laws. The test may be indirect, depending on piecing together what exists, or if there is evidence for what has existed, as in geology. And some laws may be generalisations from other established laws—such as dialectical laws are. But for even the most generalised laws the ultimate test is their conformity to objective reality.

The Laws of Dialectics

In the sections preceding his treatment of the laws of dialectics, Maurice Cornforth seems to be "softening up" the reader before coming to the main purpose of his article.

Laws of dialectics, he says, correctly, do not tell us what to expect in concrete circumstances, as the laws of the natural sciences do. Also correctly, he adds that the laws of dialectics "differ from laws of nature in being much more *general*, or *universal*." Referring to the dialectical law of the interconnection of things, he further says that:

> "This generalisation, or general law about everything, is confirmed by the whole of experience, by every phenomenon that has ever been investigated. . . . Experience does confirm that that is how things are. . . ."

So far, so good, and one would think it enough.

But Maurice Cornforth is not content with the mere conformity of dialectical laws to objective reality. He goes on:

> "But we may submit this universal generalisation to another test than the test of continually examining things and finding whether or not it applies to them. This is the test suggested by asking the question: 'How could it *not* apply?' "

Here the "it is not possible to *imagine*" anything different, used by Maurice Cornforth in relation to laws of logic and mathematics, pops up its head again, though in a slightly different form. "How could it *not* apply?" is the same argument as "It is not possible to *imagine* it not applying," and it is not an argument that is in harmony with a consistent materialist outlook.

Almost the whole of humanity, before Marx discovered the laws of dialectics (except perhaps Hegel, in an idealist form), could imagine the laws of dialectics not applying, and in fact saw the world in a metaphysical, not dialectical way. Even today the greater part of mankind is in the same position. If Maurice Cornforth and Marxists generally cannot imagine the laws of dialectics not applying, this is no test whatever of the truth of the laws of dialectics, but merely shows the growth of man's knowledge of nature.

"Nature," Engels wrote, "is the test of dialectics" (*Anti-Dühring*, p. 29). And Maurice Cornforth, in the passage quoted above, says in effect the same. Why then does he feel the need to add a subjective test to the objective test of conformity with reality? Yet to put forward this subjective test seems to be the essence of his purpose in writing "Some Questions about Laws of Dialectics".

Published by the Communist Party, 16 King Street, London, W.C.2, and printed by Farleigh Press Ltd. (T.U. all depts.), Watford, Herts.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FROM EMPEROR TO CITIZEN

Vols. I and II

THE AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF AISIN-GIORO PU YI, LAST EMPEROR OF CHINA

In Volume I of this unique book the last days of the decadent Chinese Court are described. Pu Yi relates his life until he was appointed "Emperor of Manchukuo" by the Japanese.

Volume II describes his life as a political prisoner of the Chinese People's Government, his "remoulding" and his final release as an ordinary citizen.

Vol. II: 8″ × 5½″; Cloth spine; 245 pp.; 16 pp. photographs. **10s 6d**

Vols. I and II: The set **21s**

(Vol. I no longer sold separately)

Now available:

SELECTED WORKS OF MAO TSE-TUNG

Vol. I.	347 pp. Paper	**9s**
	Cloth	**14s***
Vol. II.	Forthcoming end 1965	
Vol. III.	344 pp. Paper	**9s**
	Cloth	**14s***
Vol. IV.	459 pp. Paper	**12s**
	Cloth	**17s 6d***

*Cloth editions may be ordered.

Please add 10% for post and packing.

Collet's

LONDON BOOKSHOP
64-66 Charing Cross Road, London, W.C.2.

IF YOU WANT GOOD BOOKS FOR CHRISTMAS our current list provides them.

The Life and Teaching of Karl Marx, by John Lewis (42s.), is already selling out. It will be reprinted—but best order your copy right away.

Education and the Labour Movement, by Brian Simon (50s.), and *From Right to Left*, by D. N. Pritt (42s.), are also selling fast.

Then there are *My Life with the Miners*, by Abe Moffat (42s.), and *The Internationale*, by R. Palme Dutt (36s.). And, considerably cheaper as a paperback, *The Freedom of Art*, by Honor Arundel 8s. 6d., which John Berger, regretting it wasn't cheaper still, said is "the best introduction to art available to the British labour movement").

Just published are *Marxism and the Linguistic Philosophy*, by Maurice Cornforth (55s.), *Men, Machines and History*, by Sam Lilley (45s.), and Christopher Caudwell's *The Concept of Freedom* (35s.) and *Poems* (25s.).

Early in the New Year, A. L. Morton's famous *People's History of England* will appear as a paperback (15s.), and Christopher Hill's *The English Revolution* (7s. 6d.).

And then there will be *Last Memoirs*, by William Gallacher (illustrated, 45s.).

LAWRENCE & WISHART

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LENIN

COLLECTED WORKS

Volumes 27 and 28

(1918-1919)

These two volumes contain Lenin's writings of one year—July 1918 to July 1919. It was a year of almost incredible difficulties for the new workers' state—military defeat, economic chaos, famine, counter-revolution, and political dissension among the avowed supporters of socialism; all this, and the efforts made by the Soviet government and Lenin personally to fight through the difficulties, is vividly brought out in these contemporary documents. They also show the care taken to sow the seeds of a new order even while the enemy was still at (and within) the gates. There are articles, speeches, letters, instructions, etc., to every sort and kind of organisation and grouping—a congress of internationalist teachers, the First All-Russian congress of working women, the founding Congress of the Communist International.

***12s 6d** each volume*

CENTRAL BOOKS
37 Grays Inn Road London WC1

Full catalogue on request with details of Marxist classics, books from socialist countries, etc.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED